г	9000
	Page 1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
	FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
2	LAFAYETTE DIVISION
	Civil Action No. 6:22-cv-01130
3	
4	STATE OF ARIZONA, et al.,
5	Plaintiffs,
6	v.
7	MERRICK GARLAND, in his official
	Capacity as Attorney General of the
8	United States, et al.,
9	Defendants.
	/
10	
11	
12	DEPOSITION OF ANDREW ARTHUR
13	Taken Via Video Conference
14	Thursday, December 14, 2023
15	Beginning at 10:05 a.m.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Job No. CS6327627

	9069
	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL
2	On behalf of the Plaintiffs:
3	SCOTT ST. JOHN, Esq.
	Deputy Solicitor General
4	Louisiana Department of Justice
	1885 North 3rd Street
5	Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802
	225-485-2458
6	stjohn@ag.louisiana.gov
7	
8	On behalf of the Defendants:
9	ERIN T. RYAN, Esq.
	EVAN SCHULTZ, Esq.
10	SARAH VULONG, Esq.
	SYDNEY JACKSON, Esq.
11	U.S. Department of Justice
	Civil Division
12	Office of Immigration Litigation
	District Court Section
13	P.O. Box 868, Ben Franklin Station
- A	Washington, D.C. 20044
14	202-532-5802
1 -	erin.t.ryan@usdoj.gov
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
2 2	
23	
24	
25	
_ •	

Case 6:22-cv-01130-DCJ-CBW Document 214-19, Filed 12/22/23 Page 3 of 315 Page 12, 2023

	19070, Intilal Becomes 11, 202
	Page 3
1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION
2	Page
3	By Mr. Schultz 5, 240
4	By Mr. St. John 217
5	INDEX OF EXHIBITS
6	Number Description Page
7	Exhibit 1 Notice of Deposition 20
8	Exhibit 2 December 8, 2023 E-mail 20
9	Exhibit 3 Expert Report 22
10	Exhibit 4 Executive Office For Immigration Review
11	Adjudication Statistics 192
12	Exhibit 5 Executive Office For Immigration Review
13	Adjudication Statistics 195
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
- 1	

Page 4 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 3 (Witness Sworn.) So we are on the record. 4 MR. SCHULTZ: 5 again, it's 10:05 a.m. Andrew Arthur, the 6 witness, has just taken the oath of office. 7 This is Evan Schultz speaking. Opposing Counsel 8 is Scott. And Scott, because this deposition is 9 virtual and the court reporter is not in the 10 same room as you, do we agree that the court 11 reporter is an officer who is permitted to 12 administer the oath by video conference? 13 MR. ST. JOHN: Assuming she's a North 14 Carolina court reporter, yes. MR. SCHULTZ: Ms. Marsh did tell me before 15 16 that she's in North Carolina, and I saw her 17 nodding her head. 18 Do you want to confirm that, Ms. Marsh? 19 COURT REPORTER: Yes, I am in North Carolina. 20 21 MR. SCHULTZ: And Scott, Counsel, do you 2.2 agree not to record this deposition? 23 MR. ST. JOHN: You know, I will agree to 24 the rules and nothing more, nothing less. 25 had an e-mail correspondence and this came up

	3012
	Page 5
1	during the last deposition. The state does not
2	make stipulations that are not agreed to in
3	advance.
4	So if you're asking for anything, it's
5	going to be the rules, nothing more, nothing
6	less.
7	MR. SCHULTZ: Are you recording this?
8	MR. ST. JOHN: I'm not the one being
9	deposed. So the state agrees to the rules,
10	nothing more, nothing less.
11	MR. SCHULTZ: Okay. And I'm sorry, are you
12	currently recording this now is all I'm asking.
13	MR. ST. JOHN: I'm not the witness. I'm
14	not here to answer questions.
15	MR. SCHULTZ: Okay. So you're not going to
16	answer that. Thank you.
17	ANDREW ARTHUR,
18	having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:
19	EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. SCHULTZ:
21	Q. Judge Arthur, do you agree not to record
22	this deposition? I saw your head. I couldn't hear,
23	though.
24	A. Sorry. I was opening a thing of nuts. I
25	do. I muted myself. Sorry about that.

- Q. That's okay. Thank you. All you all set?

 Do you want to take another minute before we start?
 - A. I'm good to go, Counsel. Please.
- Q. Thank you. And turning to Judge Arthur, do you agree not to text or call or e-mail or instant message any person during this deposition unless we're on a break and there's no question pending, except for figuring out whether or not there's a privilege? Is that something you can agree to, sir?
 - A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Okay. Thanks. And are you currently in a quiet place where you won't be disturbed, where you won't be overheard?
 - A. I am, sir.
- Q. Thanks. I'm going to be asking you a series of questions and the reporter is going to write down your answers to that.

Do you understand that?

- A. I do, sir.
- Q. This isn't the first time you've been deposed. I know you were deposed in this case a week or so ago as a 30(b)(6) witness; is that right?
 - A. That's correct, sir.
- Q. This will sound familiar, but I'll still go through these just to make sure everything is on the

record.

2.2

2.3

You do need to give verbal responses. That means please don't just nod your head. Please don't just say "uh-huh." Do you understand that you need to answer questions using words?

- A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. Thank you. And when you speak -- and this is always true, but all the more so because we're virtual here or I should say we're on the Microsoft Teams remote system -- please always be sure to use a strong voice and to speak clearly, and that way the court reporter can transcribe the deposition accurately.

So do you understand that it's important for you to please speak clearly and loudly?

- A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. And something else to point out -- this is always true again, but all the more so in virtual depositions: It can be very difficult whenever there's any crosstalk at all because sometimes the words will just cut out and then the court reporter won't hear anything.

So let's just everyone be aware of that and try not to talk over each other. Some of it inevitably happens. Is that something you can please

Case 6:22-cv-01130-DCJ-CBW Document 214-19, Filed 12/22/23 Page 8 of 315 Page ID #: December 14, 2023 Page 8 1 try to avoid? 2. Yes, sir. Α. 3 Thank you. Okay. And along those same Ο. 4 lines, when I ask a question, please wait for me to finish the question before you answer. 5 It makes it easier for the court reporter, but it also makes it 6 easier for you so you know where I'm going. 7 8 So do you understand to please wait for me 9 to finish asking the questions? 10 Α. I do, Counsel. 11 Thank you. And if you don't hear a Ο. 12 question, I can repeat it. And if you don't 13 understand a question, I can repeat it. 14 So is it clear to you that if you don't 15 hear the question or that you don't understand the 16 question, that you should please tell me? 17 Α. Yes, Counsel. 18 0. Okay. Now, unless you tell me otherwise, 19 I'm going to assume that you've understood and heard 20 the entire question. 21 So can you please confirm that 22 understanding that I just told you? 2.3 Α. Yes, Counsel. And if I don't understand

anything that you say or don't hear part of it, I

will ask you to repeat it.

24

Page 9 1 Q. Please. Thank you so much. That will be 2 helpful. 3 Now, please don't guess. If you don't know the answer to a question, please just tell me that 4 5 you don't know the answer. 6 So do you understand that you shouldn't 7 guess? 8 Α. I do, Counsel. 9 Ο. Okay. Thank you. MR. SCHULTZ: And let me just turn to 10 11 Ms. Marsh for a second. Is this pace okay for 12 Are you doing okay taking everything down? 13 COURT REPORTER: Yes. It's perfect. BY MR. SCHULTZ: 14 15 Okay. So turning back to Judge Arthur, 16 this testimony is being given under oath, which is 17 similar to the oath that one takes on a stand at 18 trial. 19 So do you understand that you just now this 20 morning took an oath to give complete and truthful 21 answers? 2.2 I did, Counsel. Α. 2.3 Okay. Now, if you realize at some point Ο. 24 during the deposition that an earlier answer that you 25 gave was incomplete or not accurate, please just let

me know and I will give you a chance to follow up on that. Okay?

- A. Thank you, Counsel. Yes.
- Q. Now, we can take breaks during the deposition. If you need to take one, please let me know. Same for you, Counsel, and we will do the same.

So first of all, do you understand that you can ask for a break?

A. I do, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q. Now, if there's a question pending, I am going to ask you to please answer the question before we take the break.

So do you understand that?

- A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. And please only answer the questions that I've asked. Again, it just helps move things along in many ways.

So do you understand that you should only answer the questions that I ask, please?

- A. I do, Mr. Schultz.
- Q. Now, after the deposition is over, there will be a transcript that's circulated, and at that point you can review the transcript that's going to be generated by the court reporter from the testimony

Page 11 1 today, and you'll have an opportunity to correct any 2 errors or typos that you find. 3 Do you understand that? 4 Α. I do, Counsel. 5 And if you do make changes to the Ο. 6 transcript, then I will be able to comment on those 7 changes at trial. 8 Do you understand that as well? 9 I do, Counsel. Α. So given everything I've just said, 10 0. Okay. 11 do you understand the rules of the deposition that 12 I've just went over with you? 13 Α. I do, Counsel. 14 0. Okay. And are there any physical or mental conditions that could interfere with your testimony 15 16 today? 17 Α. There are none. 18 Thank you. And is there any reason that Q. 19 would prevent you from giving full, accurate, and truthful testimony today? 20 21 There is none, Counsel. 2.2 Okay. All right. Well, thank you. Ο. So let 2.3 me change gears a little bit. Thank you for going 24 through those rules and initial questions with me. 25 I'm going to turn now to a little bit of

the preparation that you've done for the actual report that you've wrote and also for the litigation generally.

So let me ask you this: When I refer to the lawsuit or this lawsuit, do you understand that I'm talking about the case that we're involved in now that you're giving testimony in that you also gave the testimony for in the 30(b)(6) deposition?

- A. That's right, Mr. Schultz. Arizona versus Garland.
 - Q. Yes. Thank you.

2.2

When did you first become aware of this lawsuit?

A. I'm not entirely sure when I first became aware of the lawsuit. Part of my job, my normal job, I'm a resident fellow in law and policy at the Center For Immigration Studies. And in the course of my job at the Center For Immigration Studies, I keep track of lawsuits, litigation over various policies, including administrative procedure of cases. So I can't really tell you a specific date.

It might have been pretty close to the time it was filed. It might have been thereafter.

Q. And you wrote about this lawsuit in something that you wrote for CIS on October 11, 2022.

Page 13 1 Do you remember that? 2 I do not, Counsel. Α. 3 Okay. Well, let me just change it this Ο. way: Do you remember learning about this case before 4 5 you wrote about it -- I should say, do you remember 6 about this -- scratch that. 7 Do you remember hearing about this case 8 before October 11, 2022? 9 2022? Well, obviously, I'm not entirely Α. I would have known about it in advance of 10 11 writing about it. 12 Q. Okay. So how did you end up coming into contact with the plaintiffs in this case? 13 14 I was approached by the State of Louisiana 15 and asked whether I would offer expert testimony in 16 this case. 17 Ο. Okay. And when you say the state, was 18 there a specific person who approached you? 19 Α. Scott St. John. 20 Q. Scott St. John. Thank you. That's counsel 21 here today for Louisiana, correct? 2.2 Correct. Yes. Α. 2.3 Do you know what date Mr. St. John Ο. 24 approached you? 25 Α. I would not. I'd have to go back. I just

don't know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Do you know what year it was?
- A. Honestly, I don't know that either.
- Q. Okay. At some point did you enter into a contract with Mr. St. John on behalf of Louisiana?
 - A. I did.
- Q. Okay. Do you know the date of that contract?
 - A. I do not. I don't have it in front of me.
 - Q. Do you remember the year of the contract?
 - A. I really don't.
- Q. Okay. Can you tell me what the contract said, please?
- A. It asked me to offer my expert opinion in this matter and it set an amount of money that I was going to be paid for offering my expert testimony.

 And there was discussion with Mr. St. John about the amount that I would be paid.
- Q. Okay. So when you said that you were asked to offer your expert testimony, did it say what areas that your expertise would be used for?
- A. I'd have to look at the contractual agreement, Counsel.
- Q. Let me ask you this: Do you remember if he asked you to use your expertise in immigration law?

Page 15 1 Α. I believe so, yes. Ο. Is that a yes or you believe so? 3 Α. I believe so. I'd need to --4 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. 5 THE WITNESS: -- look at the contract to 6 see the exact terms. 7 MR. ST. JOHN: I would object. This is a 8 written document. Best evidence rule, you 9 can -- the written document is definitive. The 10 witness has testified that he has vaque 11 recollection of it, so we should be looking at 12 the written document. 13 MR. SCHULTZ: Do you have a copy of that? 14 MR. ST. JOHN: Not on me, no. 15 BY MR. SCHULTZ: Judge Arthur, do you have a copy of that? 16 O. 17 Α. I don't have a copy. 18 0. Please send us a copy of that by tomorrow 19 close of business. 20 MR. ST. JOHN: I'll take that under 21 advisement. Unfortunately, one of your 22 colleagues indicated that the United States 2.3 would not take requests on the record for 24 production of expert-related materials, so I 25 hate to be like this, but what's good for the

Page 16 1 goose is good for the gander, so we'll take the 2 request under advisement. 3 MR. SCHULTZ: Okay. I appreciate that. 4 Thank you. 5 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 6 Q. Judge Arthur, can you -- if you do 7 remember, and again, if you don't, please just say 8 you don't remember, but if you do remember and since 9 I don't have a copy of that document, did it -- to the best of your recollection, did it ask you to 10 11 speak about any other area of expertise besides 12 immigration law? 13 I don't remember. I'd need to look at the contract that I signed with the State of Louisiana. 14 15 Ο. Okay. So have you done any preparation for 16 the deposition today? 17 I have spoken to my Counsel in advance of 18 this deposition today -- or Counsel for the State of Louisiana, rather. I apologize. 19 20 Q. Thank you. That was the next question I 21 was going to ask. You read my mind. Thank you. 2.2 So that's Mr. St. John, correct? 2.3 That's correct. Α. 24 Did you speak to anyone else to Ο. Okay.

prepare for this deposition today?

- A. I did not. But let me just add the caveat, Mr. Schultz, that this is what I do for a living.

 And so I'm constantly reviewing issues that relate to immigration law. I write a daily blog.
- Q. Okay. Again, that's fine. I understand there's overlap in the material. Again, I'm asking about what you did to prepare specifically for the deposition.
- A. I spoke to my counsel and reviewed the submissions in the matter.
- Q. And just to make -- just to nail it down since you added that wrinkle a moment ago, aside from Mr. St. John, have you spoken to anyone else to prepare for the deposition today?
 - A. No, sir.

2.3

- Q. Okay. Have you looked at any documents to prepare for the deposition today?
- A. The documents that were submitted in the matter.
- Q. Okay. And what do you mean by the documents that were submitted in the matter? Can you clarify that more, please?
- A. The interim Plyler rule that was published on March 29th, 2022, my own statement, and other documents that have been submitted for the record in

Page 18 1 I can't really remember what they are. this case. 2 had a lot. 3 Ο. So by the other documents that were submitted in this case, do you mean documents that 4 5 were exchanged during the discovery process? 6 Α. I believe that's correct. 7 0. Okay. How many times did you meet with Mr. St. John to talk about this case -- talk about 8 9 this deposition? Yesterday and today. 10 11 Okay. And how long did you meet with him 0. 12 yesterday? 13 Couple or three hours, if I had to make a Α. 14 guess. 15 And how long did you meet with him today? Ο. 16 About an hour. About an hour. Α. 17 Ο. Is there -- is there any other time, aside 18 from yesterday and today, that you met with 19 Mr. St. John to prepare for this deposition? Not that I can remember. 20 Α. 21 Ο. Okay. Did you meet with any other lawyers from his office or any other plaintiffs' office to 2.2 23 talk about the deposition while you prepared for it? 24 Α. I did not, sir. 25 Q. Thank you. Did you speak to anyone else

about this deposition, whether or not it was to prepare for it? Have you spoken to anyone else about this deposition?

- A. I've spoken to people in my office to let them know that I would be having this deposition today. My boss, Mark Krikorian, who is the executive director for the Center of Immigration Studies and Margaret Telford, who is our press person, about this, just to let them know that I would be having the deposition today and should not be bothered.
- Q. Okay. Did you talk about the substance of the deposition with them?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. No.

2.2

2.3

- Q. Now, you had mentioned that you reviewed your statements to prepare for the deposition today. By that, do you mean the expert report that you prepared?
 - A. That is correct, sir.
- Q. Okay. So I'm going to actually mark a couple of exhibits here. And this is the technological process, so this is going to take a moment for me to make sure I get this right. So I'm going to click here. Is that right?

2.2

2.3

Page 20

So my goal here is to basically get a couple of documents to both of you on Teams just to take a quick look at. If it doesn't work, please let me know and we can see if we can find another way to get them to you.

So the first one is going to be the deposition notice. We'll mark that as Exhibit No. 1.

(EXHIBIT NO. 1 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. SCHULTZ: And this is something, Scott, you've already received, just putting it in for purposes of the record.

This is going to be Exhibit No. 1, and Exhibit No. 2 is going to be the e-mail you sent the other day, agreeing to this as a virtual deposition. That's Exhibit No. 2.

(EXHIBIT NO. 2 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. ST. JOHN: For the record, these are not being displayed on the screen, so I'm having to rely on your representation of what they are.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

Q. Thank you for saying that. What we're trying to do is put them in the chat so that you can actually download them from the chat. Hopefully they will appear in a moment and you can download that yourself.

1 Should I be looking at this in the chat Α. 2 too? 3 If you could, yes. If you could let me 0. 4 know if you do see them, then we can figure out our 5 next steps. 6 I can see it, I just can't -- oh, open in Α. 7 browser. There we go. 8 MR. ST. JOHN: I'm getting access denied. 9 MR. SCHULTZ: Access denied. Interesting. 10 Let's try another technological trick then. 11 Thanks. 12 Thanks for your patience. I think we're 13 sharing the screen now. I'm just scrolling up 14 so you can see the Notice of Deposition there. 15 Scott, is that something that you can see? 16 MR. ST. JOHN: Yes. I have no -- I don't 17 think I have any control over it, but I can see 18 it appears to be an AOLA-Arthur tab. 19 MR. SCHULTZ: Yeah. And can you see it 20 says Defendant's Notice of Deposition? 21 MR. ST. JOHN: Yes. 22 MR. SCHULTZ: Okay. So that's going to be 2.3 Exhibit No. 1. I'm sorry, I think you might just be seeing a portion. So now you should be 24 25 able to see the full front page there.

Page 22 1 going to be Exhibit No. 1. 2 And then Exhibit No. 2 is going to be the 3 e-mail, Scott, that you sent confirming that 4 this is a virtual deposition. I think you 5 called it a remote deposition. 6 So can you see that there? 7 MR. ST. JOHN: I can. 8 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 9 Okay. Thanks. And Judge Arthur, can you Ο. see those as well? 10 11 I can, Counsel. Α. 12 Q. So then for Exhibit No. 3, we are going to 13 put down your expert report, and obviously it's 14 fairly long. 15 For purposes of this, I'm going to show you 16 the front page there and we can answer any questions 17 if we need to about whether you can see it or not. 18 (EXHIBIT NO. 3 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 19 BY MR. ST. JOHN: 20 Is that something that you can see, Judge Q. 21 Arthur? 2.2 Α. I can't, sir. 23 You cannot see it yet. Okay. So hopefully Q. 24 now you can see? 25 Α. I can't -- oh, now I can.

- Q. Okay. And does that look like the title page for your expert report?
 - A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. Thanks. And that's what you reviewed when you said you reviewed the statement, right?
 - A. That's the expert report, yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And can you confirm that you wrote that?
 - A. I did, Counsel.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. ST. JOHN: For the record, the witness is only able to view like the top half of the first page, so we're having to rely on your representation that this is the expert report we provided.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

Q. Thank you. Once the transcript comes in, you'll be able to see the exhibits, and that will include the entire thing at that point. If there are any questions at that point, we'll be happy to talk about that. This is all by the book, I promise.

So that's going to be Exhibit No. 3 then, the expert report.

So turning back to Judge Arthur, when you

created the expert report, did you communicate with anyone while you prepared it, about the preparation?

A. With Mr. St. John.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Okay. And did you communicate with anyone else, aside from Mr. St. John, to help you prepare the report?
 - A. Not that I can remember, sir.
- Q. And do you remember when you communicated with Mr. St. John about your expert report?
 - A. Before it was filed and before I signed it.
- Q. Do you remember how many times you met with him about the expert report?
 - A. Honestly, I can't.
- Q. Okay. Do you have some memory even if it's a range of how many hours you met with him?
 - A. It was all -- honestly, I can't remember. I'd probably say it would be less than ten.
 - Q. Less than ten hours?
 - A. It may have been more than that, though.
 - Q. Okay. So maybe less than ten hours, maybe more than ten hours; is that what you're saying?
 - A. That's what I'm saying. I do apologize,
 Counsel. It's been a rough year for me. My mom
 died. I've had a lot of stuff going on this year.
 - Q. I'm so sorry to hear that, Judge. If at

any point you need to take a break today, by all means, let us know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- A. No. No. I apologize, sir. She died in July. It's been a very busy year at my household. In fact my sewer went up this weekend, so it's -- I've had a lot of stuff going on and work is also very busy.
- Q. Well, again, I'm so sorry to hear the news about your mother. And let's just keep going, but again, if you need to pause --
- A. Thank you. I thank you, Mr. Schultz. Thank you.
- Q. How many hours, to the best of your memory, did you spend working on your expert report?
 - A. Probably pretty close to about ten hours.
- Q. Ten hours. So and that's separate and above and beyond the ten hours, more or less, that you mentioned that you met with Mr. St. John, right?
- A. That's correct. There may be some overlap there.
- Q. Okay. And are you being paid for your work on this case?
 - A. I am, sir.
- Q. So let's try to break that down. Are you being paid separately for the deposition and for the

expert report or is it a single amount that you're being paid for that?

- A. I'm being paid a single amount, a set fee.
- Q. And what is that set fee, please?
- A. \$2,000.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

- Q. Okay. And that's being paid by whom?
- A. The State of Louisiana, the Attorney General's Office, as I understand it.
- Q. Okay. Have you received a check that you've cashed?
- A. I have not. I just signed as a contractor with the State of Louisiana through a pretty complicated website. I'm still not even 100 percent sure that I did it correctly, but yeah, I haven't received it.
- Q. Okay. And do you know if any of the other plaintiffs are paying you?
 - A. Nobody else is paying me.
- Q. Okay.
 - A. Again, I get paid by the Center For Immigration Studies.
 - Q. But you also mentioned that you have a set fee of \$2,000 that's coming to you from the State of Louisiana, right?
 - A. That's correct. None of the other

plaintiffs in this case are paying me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Okay. So is the Center For Immigration Studies paying you for your work in this case?
- A. No. The State of Louisiana is paying me for my work in this case. Immigration analysis, educating the public about immigration issues is what I get paid for by the Center For Immigration Studies. I'm the resident fellow in law and policy.
- Q. So when you wrote the article that you did back in, I think it was October 22nd of 2022, that was something that was paid -- where the money you received was from CIS, though, right?
- A. That's correct. I'm also a retired government annuitant.
- Q. Right. I'm just asking you about things related to this case. Thank you for mentioning that.

Okay. Let's turn a little bit to your background then, and let's talk about your education specifically. And some of this is in your report, but I just want to make sure we get the contours down.

So did you go to college?

- A. I did, sir.
- Q. And where did you go to college?
- A. I'm a graduate of the University of

Page 28 1 Virginia. I spent one year at Loyola College in 2 Baltimore, Maryland, my first year of college. 3 Ο. So starting at Loyola for one year, then you moved to the University of Virginia in 4 5 Charlottesville? 6 Α. That is correct, sir. 7 Q. Did you graduate from the University of Virginia in Charlottesville? 8 9 In May of 1988 with a bachelor of arts in Α. 10 history. 11 Okay. What sort of history? Ο. 12 My thesis was in Russian history. Α. 13 Ο. Russian. It was on Gorbachev's alcohol policies and 14 15 the impact it would have on Russian society. 16 Q. Okay. Did you have any other majors aside 17 from history at the University of Virginia? 18 I had a concentration in economics. Α. 19 Okay. So let's start with the majors. Q. Did 20 you have any other majors? 21 Α. I did not. 2.2 Did you have any minors? Q. 23 I did not. Α. 24 You said --Q. 25 Α. But I did have a concentration in

economics.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Thank you. And what does that mean, a concentration?
- A. So a lot of the work that I did with -- a lot of the studies, the classes that I took had to do with the economic ramifications of historical events, so I've taken microeconomics, macroeconomics, accounting, money and banking. The only class that I have left to receive my economics degree is statistics. I'm not sure that Charlottesville will take me back at this juncture.
- Q. Okay. And when you say to receive your degree, do you mean an undergraduate degree?
- A. That's correct, sir, to get another BA in economics.
- Q. To get another BA in economics. Okay. But you don't have that, correct?
 - A. I do not, sir.
- Q. Did you have any other minors or concentrations at University of Virginia?
- A. I did not. Not that I'm aware of. Economics is the only one.
- Q. Okay. You said you graduated from college.

 Did you have any joint degrees when you
 graduated from University of Virginia with your BA?

A. I did not, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. And then from your resum , I see that you have other education. So did you go to law school after that?
 - A. I did.
 - Q. And then where did you go to law school?
- A. I attended George Washington University,
 The National Law Center in Washington, D.C. in May of
 1992.
 - Q. So you graduated in May of '92?
- A. Correct, sir.
 - Q. And was there any sort of a major that you had in law school?
 - A. No, sir.
 - Q. Was there any sort of a minor or a concentration that you had in law school?
- 17 A. No, sir.
 - Q. Did you get some sort of specialty certification when you were in law school in any area?
 - A. I did not. I did get the highest grade in my constitutional law class, but they didn't give out an award.
 - Q. Was there any substantive specialty that you took a course of study in while you were in law

Page 31 1 school --2 Α. No. -- where you received a certificate? 3 0. 4 Α. No. 5 0. When you -- you said you graduated from law 6 school in 1992, correct? 7 Α. Correct, sir. And when you graduated, did you receive any 8 Q. 9 joint degrees? I did not, sir. 10 11 So it looks like -- so you graduated from 0. 12 college in 1988, graduated from law school in '92. 13 Law school is usually three years. Was your law 14 school three years? 15 Α. It was, sir. 16 So it looks like there's a year in the Ο. 17 middle there that's not accounted for. Can you tell 18 me what you did for that time? 19 I worked as an adjuster for the Sovereign Α. Credit Corporation in Charlottesville, Virginia. 20 21 0. What does an adjuster mean? 2.2 I would write loans, small loans for Α. 2.3 Sovereign Credit Corporation, which was a branch of 24 Sovereign Bank NA, and I would collect on those loans 25 as well.

- Q. And what years or months did you have that job?
- A. I took that job, I believe, in July of 1988 and I left Sovereign directly before I moved to Washington, D.C. to go to George Washington. I actually moved to Arlington, Virginia.
- Q. And since that was in Charlottesville, did you take any classes at the university during that year?
 - A. I did not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Okay. Aside from the college degree and your law school degree that you just mentioned, have you received any other academic degrees?
 - A. No academic degrees.
 - Q. Okay. Do you have a PhD?
- A. I do not, sir.
 - Q. Okay. So is there anything else about your education experience that I haven't asked about that would be helpful for me to know about?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
 - Q. Okay. So let's talk about your work experience. I see that at the end of your report you have an Exhibit A.

So let me ask you this: Do you have a copy of your expert report in front of you?

Page 33 1 Α. I can get one. 2 Q. If it's -- that would be helpful. 3 you. Very good. 4 Α. 5 Yeah, Counsel, by the way, it's -- I 6 apologize, there's highlighter marks on it. Is that 7 going to be a problem for you? 8 Q. This is just for your own reference. I'm 9 not going to even see it. 10 Α. Okay. 11 0. Okay. 12 Α. I wasn't concerned about you. I just want 13 to -- for the deposition. Okay. It's not going to be in evidence. 14 Ο. 15 This is just to refresh your memory a little bit or 16 to make things easier for you to follow along as I 17 ask you questions. Okay? 18 That's good, Counsel. Α. 19 If we had been in the same room, I would be Q. 20 handing you a printed copy of it now. Since we're 21 virtual, since you have your own copy, that makes it 2.2 fairly convenient. So thank you. 23 Scott, I see you're flipping. MR. SCHULTZ: 24 Are you all set? 25 MR. ST. JOHN: I am.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Okay. Towards the end of your actual expert report, you have a couple of exhibits, and the first one is Exhibit A. Can you flip to there, please?
- A. I don't actually have the exhibits attached to my --
 - Q. Oh, you don't? Okay.
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. Well, the Exhibit A that I have says
 "Experience" and then it lists your jobs and it goes
 on for about -- it goes on for two pages.

Do you remember writing that up?

- A. Is that my CV? Is that my resum ?
- Q. It says "Experience." It looks like it might have -- it looks like it's fairly similar to a resum. It has your name and address at the top, the name of your work address at the top, and says "Experience" and it lists about eight or ten items.

Do you remember writing that?

- A. Actually, I do not, but I assume that I did write it.
- Q. Okay. So let's go then and we're going to call that up and show it to you then. So this is going to be immediately after page 37 of the expert

report, where it says Exhibit A.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I'm going to share that with you. And we're just going to scroll down that slowly so you can see what we're talking about here.

- A. Yeah, that's my CV.
- Q. I'm just talking about the two pages here, so that's the first page I just showed you and here is the second page.
 - A. That is correct, sir.
- Q. Okay. So does that remind you what you wrote up in Exhibit A now?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. So I'm just talking about those first two pages here.

Have you had a chance to look at that or do you want us to scroll through it again more slowly?

- A. I'm familiar with it. I submit this in connection with congressional testimony and other things.
- Q. So Exhibit A was all of your job experience since you graduated from college?
- A. It does not include the Sovereign Credit
 Corporation, and I served briefly as a panelist with
 the Foreign Impasse Dispute Panel at the Department
 of Labor. I was the outside panelist.

- Page 36 1 Q. And how long was that for? 2 About eight months, I think. Maybe a year. Α. 3 And do you remember when that was, please? 0. The Foreign Impasse Disputes Panel is a 4 Α. 5 panel under the Department of Labor. 6 0. I'm sorry, I'm just asking what years you 7 worked there. Oh, it was after I had retired from the 8 9 government. I believe it was from the fall of 20 --MR. ST. JOHN: Mr. Arthur, if you don't 10 11 remember, it's okay. 12 THE WITNESS: I really don't remember, but 13 it probably would have been from the fall of 14 20 -- I've got to think about this for a second, 2017, maybe 2018, and we only ever convened once 15 16 and that was at the beginning of the panel. 17 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 18 Thank you. And what was -- now to Q. Okay. 19 go back to what you were saying a minute ago, what 20 was that involving? What was the substance of the 21 work that the panel did? 2.2 It involved disputes by foreign service Α. 2.3 officers abroad with respect to employment issues.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you. And aside from that, is there anything else that you have worked on since

24

graduating from college that's not included in Exhibit A here?

- A. I was -- I went from the -- after I graduated college, I worked on the -- I was an honors attorney with the attorney general's honor class and I went to EOIR and then INS, and not that I'm aware of.
 - Q. You said you went to EOIR and then --
 - A. The INS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. -- the INS. Then you said not that you're aware of?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. So just to make sure that we're on the same page, aside from what's listed in those two pages on Exhibit A, and adding to that your time at the Sovereign Credit Union in Charlottesville, and adding to that your time on the panel that you just mentioned, is there any other job experience you have since graduating from college?
 - A. Not that I can remember.
- Q. Thank you. Let's go back to your education for a moment. In any of your education at the University of Virginia or at George Washington University, did you study expenditures for education in state and local budgets?

A. I did not.

2.2

2.3

- Q. Okay. And for any of your education at the University of Virginia or at George Washington
 University, did you study Medicaid or children's health insurance programs or emergency medical services in state and local budgets?
- A. I did not. I'm actually married to a surgeon who is currently getting her masters in health administration from the University of North Carolina and she bounces a lot of things off of me in connection with that, in connection with Medicare and things like that.
- Q. Okay. So thank you for adding that, but I'm going to repeat my question because I didn't get a clear answer.

In any of your education at the University of Virginia or at George Washington University, did you study Medicaid, did you study children's health insurance programs, or emergency medical services in state and local budgets?

- A. I did not.
- Q. Thank you. And in any of your education at the University of Virginia or at George Washington
 University, did you study expenditures for supplemental nutrition assistance program or the

temporary assistance for needy families in expenditures in state and local budgets?

A. I did not.

2.3

2.5

- Q. Thank you. I'll turn to your work experience for a moment. So let me just give you a definition upfront to make sure we're on the same page. I'm going refer to Exhibit A, plus the credit union and plus the foreign panel that you mentioned. Okay? I'm going to call that, just for purposes of this question, Exhibit A, plus credit union, plus panel. Okay?
 - A. Very good.
- Q. Okay. So in any of the work experiences that you discussed in Exhibit A, plus the credit union, plus the panel, did you work on expenditures for education in state and local budgets?
- A. I assume that this includes my work at the Center For Immigration Studies, because of course we do look at the impacts of budgetary issues on states and localities and we also look at welfare programs in the course of that.

We often write about means-tested public benefits use in the United States.

- Q. Okay.
- A. Under the American -- usually based upon

information provided by the Census Bureau's American community documents.

- Q. Okay. So then let me rephrase the question a little bit and we'll circle back if we can.
 - A. Okay.

2.2

2.3

- Q. So in any of the work experiences that you discussed in your expert report and the two pages after Exhibit A, plus the credit union, plus the foreign panel, not including CIS, did you work for expenditures in state and local budgets?
 - A. I did not.
- Q. And in any of the work experiences that you discussed in your expert report and the two pages after Exhibit A, plus the Sovereign Credit Union, plus the foreign panel, but not including CIS, did you work on Medicaid, children on health insurance programs, or emergency medical services in state and local budgets?
- A. It may have come up during my time on the House Judiciary Committee. We certainly looked at issues like that particularly with respect to the implementation of PRWORA.
 - Q. Implementation of what?
- A. Personal Responsibility of Work Opportunity Act of 1996, PRWORA.

Page 41 1 Q. Okay. Thank you. And that was in '96, 1996, correct? 2 When I was at the judiciary committee? 3 Α. You just said that the law was passed in 4 0. 5 1996. 6 Α. Yeah, the law was passed in 1996. 7 Ο. And when would you have worked on those 8 issues then? 9 When I was with the House Judiciary Α. I served there from September of 2001 10 11 until November of 2006. 12 Ο. Now, you were a little bit vague, so let me 13 try and drill it down. You said you may have worked on it. 14 15 you saying that you may have or do you have a firm 16 memory that you did? 17 We generally addressed a lot of welfare 18 issues with the oversight counsel for immigration for 19 the House Judiciary Committee during the period of 20 time that judiciary had jurisdiction over all 21 immigration-related issues. And we certainly looked at means-tested public benefits during that time. 2.2 2.3 Q. Okay. Thank you. Sorry. 24 Okay. So again, let's move forward. 25 Again, using the phrasing that I've been using, in

Page 42 1 any of the work experience that you discussed in your 2 expert report and the two pages after Exhibit A, plus 3 the credit union, plus the foreign board, but not 4 including CIS, did you work on expenditures for 5 supplemental nutrition assistance program or 6 temporary assistance to needy family expenditures in 7 state and local budgets? 8 MR. ST. JOHN: Object to form. 9 THE WITNESS: Again, we would have looked at that in conjunction with the work that we did 10 11 looking at means-tested public benefits 12 generally. 13 MR. SCHULTZ: Thank you. Just on 14 logistics, I'm getting a bit of feedback or some 15 rustling noises. I'm not sure where it's coming 16 If folks are rustling, if you can please from. 17 It may be interfere a little bit with the 18 audio. But turning to Ms. Marsh, have you been 19 able to hear and take down everything clear 20 enough? 21 COURT REPORTER: Yes, I have. I was 2.2 hearing the rustling too, but it's fine. 2.3 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 24 So you wrote in your expert report Ο. Okay.

that you testified in Congress 11 times; is that

Page 43 1 right? 2 Α. That's correct, sir. 3 Have you ever testified in Congress about Ο. the IFR? 4 5 I'm trying to think if the IFR ever came up Α. 6 during any of the course of my testimony. I can't 7 say for certain. MR. ST. JOHN: I would object. It's public 8 9 record. You've had a chance to review his 10 testimony before Congress and it shouldn't be a 11 memory game. 12 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 13 Okay. Have you ever testified in Congress Ο. 14 about expenditures for education in state and local 15 budgets? 16 MR. ST. JOHN: Same objection. 17 THE WITNESS: I believe that expenditures 18 in state and local budgets came up during 19 testimony that I gave in Arizona in August. BY MR. SCHULTZ: 20 21 Ο. You gave in Arizona in August. So that was not for Congress, that was for Arizona? 2.2 2.3 That was appeal hearing for the Α. No. No. 24 house oversight committee, I believe. 25 Q. The house oversight committee. Thank you.

Page 44 1 What was the date for that one, please? 2 It was in August of this year. Trying to Α. 3 Was it in August? My CV should show the 4 date. I apologize again. It was a rough summer for 5 me, sir. 6 Q. Okay. Thank you. Just one moment here, 7 please. 8 I think -- Judge Arthur, can you hear me 9 again now? 10 Α. I can. 11 Thank you. So let me just make sure Ο. Okay. 12 I got the answer right. There was some crosstalk 13 that we had from Mr. St. John, so I want to make sure 14 I have a clean answer from you. 15 Have you ever testified in Congress about 16 the IFR? 17 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. His testimony is 18 public record. This shouldn't be a memory game. 19 You can answer. 20 MR. SCHULTZ: Mr. St. John, your objection 21 is noted, but I would ask you to please minimize the speaking. Noting your objection for the 2.2 record I think should be sufficient. 23 24 BY MR. SCHULTZ:

Judge Arthur, you can answer that question

25

Q.

now, please. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- A. It may have come up in the course of questioning. And for what it's worth, I may have included it in my testimony. I can't remember whether I did or not.
 - Q. Okay. So --
- A. By the way, when I say "my testimony," I mean my written testimony.
- Q. Does that mean your written testimony to Congress?
 - A. That's correct, sir.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. Do you know which set of testimony that is?
- A. It would have been something after the IFR. Again, it may have been included in my testimony. My testimony generally runs a little long, and I try to cover the subject area as much as possible. I believe that it's my duty to inform the Congress, to the degree that I can, as exhaustively as I can.
- Q. Have you ever testified in Congress about Medicaid or children's health insurance programs or emergency medical services expenditures in local or state governments?

MR. ST. JOHN: Same objection.

THE WITNESS: I believe that the subject of

Page 46 1 the hearing in Arizona was on the cost of 2 communities and there may have been testimony at 3 that time. When you give Congressional testimony, you're very much in the moment when 4 5 you're doing it. 6 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 7 Q. Okay. Thank you. And have you ever testified in Congress about supplemental nutrition 8 9 assistance program or temporary assistance for needy family expenditures in state or local budgets? 10 11 MR. ST. JOHN: Same objection. 12 THE WITNESS: Again, if it had come up, it 13 would have been in the course of that testimony in Arizona. 14 15 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 16 Okay. Thank you. Please tell me the Q. 17 names -- well, have you ever been an expert in any 18 litigation ever before this case? 19 Before this case, no. Α. 20 Okay. Have you testified as an expert in Q. 21 this case before now? 2.2 I was deposed previously. Α. 2.3 0. Were you deposed as an expert in this case 24 previously? 25 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Question of law.

Page 47 1 THE WITNESS: I was deposed as a 30(b)(6) 2 witness the last time, but there were questions that did relate to issues of law in the course 3 of that. 4 5 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 6 Ο. Outside the 30(b)(6) deposition in this 7 case and the current deposition, have you ever been 8 an expert in court in any litigation ever? 9 Α. I am an expert witness right now in 10 litigation in a FOIA case. 11 Can you spell that, please? 0. 12 FOIA? F-O-I-A, Freedom of Information Act. Α. 13 Thank you. And do you know the case number Ο. 14 or the location of that, please? 15 I don't even -- I can't even remember the 16 header for that case. 17 0. Do you know who hired you for that case? 18 I was hired, I believe, by the Heritage Α. 19 Foundation for that one. 20 Q. Is that case ongoing? 21 Α. It is. 2.2 Okay. And I'm going to request you please Q. 23 send us at least the caption for that case by close 24 of business tomorrow, please. 25 MR. ST. JOHN: Again, we'll take that

1 request under advisement.

MR. SCHULTZ: Thank you. We can follow up in writing. Thank you, Scott.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Q. So I'd like to talk to you about a couple of odds and ends here. So I'm going to just mention something that you talked about as part of your background.

You said in your expert report, you wrote something that was called President Trump's Travel Orders in National Security, and that was in publication called Migration and Solidarity in 2020; is that correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Was that a foreign publication?
- A. It is a publication that is jointly done foreign and in the United States, which I think is why there's a split, and I presented on that at Banz Castle in Bavaria at the time that the paper was presented.
- Q. And you mentioned that in paragraph ten, just for the record; is that right, if you remember?
- A. As I remember. I can take a look at that part of my testimony.
 - Q. If you want to take a moment now, that's

Page 49 1 fine to look at it. 2 Α. Sure. There's another publication in that same 3 0. paragraph that I would like to ask you about. 4 5 Α. Very good. It's at paragraph ten. So let me know when 6 Ο. 7 you see that, please. I see it, Counsel. 8 Α. 9 How did that publication come about, the Ο. one that you just mentioned in Migration and 10 11 Solidarity in 2020? 12 Α. I was invited to present at the panel. Ιt 13 is an interesting panel. It is an interesting panel. It is under the aegis of the Catholic church. 14 15 the location itself is owned by the CDU, CSU, which 16 at the time was the political party of Chancellor 17 Angela Merkel. 18 Okay. And they reached out to you; is that Q. 19 right? They did. 20 Α. 21 0. Okay. And is that an article or a book? 2.2 It's an article. Α. 2.3 And did you write that in English or in a Ο. 24 different language? 25 Α. I wrote it in English. I wouldn't trust my

Page 50 1 German. 2 Do you speak German? Q. 3 Α. Only a little. Thank you. In that same paragraph, 4 Ο. I see. 5 there's another publication, and it's called the Oversize Role of Title 42 in U.S. Southwest Border 6 7 Security. It says it's published in LIMEN, L-I-M-E-N, and the Journal of Hungarian Migration 8 9 Institute, Volume 5, in 2022/1. 10 Do you see that? 11 Α. T do. 12 How did what -- first of all, was that Ο. 13 published in Hungary? It was published in Hungary. 14 I believe 15 it's available in the United States. 16 Q. And was that published in English or in 17 Magyar or Hungarian? 18 It was published in English. Α. 19 Okay. And how did that come about? Q. 20 Α. I was approached by the Hungarian Migration 21 Institute to present or to offer them a paper on it. 2.2 And what was your thesis there? Ο. 2.3 It had to do with the Oversized Role of Α. 24 Title 42 in security, and it explains that during the 25 period of time the Title 42 was in existence, that

2.2

2.3

Page 51

basically provided all immigration enforcement that there was in -- at the time it explained how it evolved from the Trump administration, how it was applied in the Biden administration.

Q. Title 42, thank you. Turning to the previous document that -- turning to the previous publication I just mentioned, the one that was published in -- published in the German publication, Migration and Solidarity.

Can you tell me the thesis of that article, please?

- A. Yeah, it actually discussed the legislative history of the Trump travel orders from the executive order through the presidential proclamation -- I think it was 9645 -- and through the litigation in Trump versus Hawaii.
- Q. Okay. Turn a little bit now to the substance of your report a little bit more. So you start off the report on page one with your education, experience, and expertise, and that goes on to page two; is that right?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. And then you go on to your -- on page two you go on to your background, and on page three -- on page two you also begin discussing the

general process for asylum; is that right?

A. That's correct, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

- Q. And on page four -- I'm sorry, page six, you start going through statutory withholding of removal and Convention Against Torture. Do you see that on page six?
 - A. Yes, I do, Counsel.
- Q. And on page seven you discuss parole, and that goes on for about a page or so until the top of page nine, right?
 - A. Correct. Yes.
 - Q. And then on page nine --
 - A. Actually goes down to page ten, I think.
 - Q. Top of page nine says transfer --
- A. I'm sorry. Never mind. You're right, transfer of a specific -- yes, sir.
- Q. Page nine at the top is transfer of specific functions to the Department of Homeland Security, correct?
- A. Correct, Counsel. I apologize. I wear bifocals, so when I look over, I can't see the text.
- Q. That's okay. If you have trouble seeing the text, please just let me know. We want to make sure that you have a full chance to look at anything that we're talking about. Okay?

A. Very good.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Thank you. So just to be clear, everything that basically covers pages one through the -- I'm sorry.

Then page ten has kind of a large font header that says "The impact of Biden administration policies on migration."

Do you see that on page ten?

- A. Yeah. I realize there's a typo on that.
- Q. What is the typo?
- A. It's in administration. Yeah, there's an extra I in administration.
- Q. Okay. So this question I have here is on everything on pages one through nine then: Nothing there deals -- addresses the IFR, does it?
 - A. No, that's background, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Okay. So then let me just ask about something else that I saw in your report in a few places, but this will go back to your experience a little bit.

You were an immigration judge for how long, sir?

- A. Eight years. Eight years, a little bit longer.
 - Q. Okay. And in your experience, does every

immigration judge grant asylum at the same rate as every other immigration judge?

A. They do not.

2.2

2.3

- Q. So would you say that there's variation between the grant rate of asylum between immigration judges?
 - A. There are.
- Q. Do you have any idea what causes that variation in grant rates?
- A. Yeah, actually, in fact, I've written and talked a lot about this. I've appeared four times before Congress with respect to that, and part of it is the interpretation of the law. Part of it is the nationalities of the respondents in the case. Part of it is the claims themselves.

As I often explain, that's why it's good to have the appellate system, because you can smooth out those variations in the grant rate.

- Q. You said nationalities. Why do nationalities matter?
- A. Nationalities matter because respondents, applicants from different countries sometimes have more meritorious claims. I've actually adjudicated asylum claims from the United Kingdom, and I've adjudicated asylum claims from China. There's a

variation amongst asylum grant rates based upon nationality.

2.2

2.3

Things are worse in certain places in the world. Certain asylum claims are bolstered by activity in foreign countries dependent on the country.

- Q. You also said -- can you say those last three words again, please?
- A. Dependent on the country. It was actually four.
- Q. Thank you. And you also said there's variations due to the claims themselves. What did you mean by that?
- A. So not all asylum claims are the same.

 Certain asylum claims are pretty straightforward

 based upon race, religion, nationality, and political

 opinion.

In countries in which there is a demonstration of persecution in those countries, it ties directly into the claim. One of the responsibilities of every immigration judge is to apply the facts in the country to the law and also to look at country conditions reports in those countries.

Q. Okay. Are there any other areas that you

can think of that might change variation?

2.2

2.3

- A. From judge to judge or country to country?
- Q. I'm thinking judge to judge.
- A. From judge to judge, it all depends on whether you are in a detained court or a nondetained court.

I was in a detained court. And for that reason, I had jurisdiction over the Federal Correctional Institution at Shannon, Pennsylvania, the Federal Correctional Institution at Allenwood, Pennsylvania, and I also had jurisdiction over the Pennsylvania state prison system.

Many of those individuals have been convicted of crimes that barred them from receiving asylum. So the asylum rate would be a lot lower.

Many of the people that I heard claims from were barred from asylum but they filed asylum claims in order to seek statutory withholding under section 241(b)3 of the INA, withholding under the Convention Against Torture and Convention Against Torture.

- Q. Would you say that variation between circuit court rulings could also lead to variations of immigration judge asylum grant rates?
- A. It does. Again, this is a point that I've testified about in the past. I've been a trial

attorney in the 9th circuit and I was a trial attorney in the 4th circuit. When I was in headquarters, I had to deal with all of the circuits, except, of course, for the DC circuit, which doesn't have any jurisdiction over immigration cases, and the federal circuit because they don't have any either.

But yeah, there's variations with respect to the law, the interpretations of section 208 of the INA.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. So you mentioned that you work at the Center For Immigration Studies, right?
 - A. I do, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- O. Do you know David North?
- A. I do know David North. I actually -- David has been working remotely. I can't really say how many times I've seen him or seen him in recent years, but I do know who David North is.
- Q. And he writes for the Center For

 Immigration Study's website. He writes a blog or

 various posts there as well, right?
 - A. Correct, sir.
 - Q. Have you read his posts?
- A. I actually -- most of the posts that he writes involve things that don't really interest me.

And I'd like to say that I read all of the stuff on our website, but I don't. I do get around to reading it from time to time.

- Q. Do you know if you read something he wrote on November 10th of this year?
- A. Could you tell me what the subject of it was? He might have written more than one thing on November 10th.
- Q. Sure. It says, "TRAC Offers Explanation on Differing Asylum Approval Ratings."
 - A. I did actually read that one.
 - Q. And --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. David had sent that to me ahead of time to take a look at.
- Q. So there's a sentence there that I'll read to you where he wrote about, "A variable stew of factors that led to the actual decisions in individual cases and to the ranges in approval rates."

So did you hear what I said there? I'm happy to repeat it.

- A. I did, Counsel.
- Q. So do you agree with Mr. North that there's a quote, "Variable stew of factors" that can, quote, "lead to the actual decisions in individual cases and

to the ranges in approval rates"?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. It's not the language that I would use, but again, I'd have to take a look at the document. I read a lot. I write a lot. That one, I would agree that there are a number of different factors to create a variation of the grant rates.
- Let's turn back to your report and go to -- actually, it's 11:12. Everyone doing okay? We've been on the record about an hour and a quarter.

Give me a moment here. Please.

MR. ST. JOHN: Why don't we take like five minutes?

MR. SCHULTZ: I'll put down 11:13 as the stop time.

(RECESS TAKEN.)

MR. SCHULTZ: I have 11:21. We are back on the record.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

Q.

- Q. Just a couple of quick follow-ups, Judge
 Arthur. So do you know why Mr. North might have sent
 you that column since you're not normally writing
 overlapping areas of work?
- A. Yeah, we share columns if it is something that is generally within somebody's area of expertise.

2.2

2.3

Page 60

- Q. Okay. Does that mean that you thought this -- does that mean you're assuming he thought this was in your area of expertise? Is that why you said that just now?
- A. Well, generally we like to get one another's opinions about things that we write.
- Q. Did he send this to you before he wrote it or before he published it or after he published it?
- A. He sent it to me before he published it, before it was sent for review and publication.
- Q. Okay. Did you have any input into that or did you make suggestions that he took?
- A. I disagreed with a lot of the statements that he made, but nobody at the center is -- everybody at the center is free to write what they want with their own opinions.
 - Q. What did you disagree with that he wrote?
- A. I'd have to take a look at the whole thing. I remember reading it. There was -- he made conclusions with respect to immigration, differences amongst immigration judge determinations. If I had a chance to read the whole thing, I'd remember. Again, we're a busy think tank. Things have been busy of late.
 - Q. But you do remember that you disagreed with

Page 61 some of the stuff? 1 2. I did. Α. 3 Okay. But not with everything that he Ο. 4 wrote? 5 I can't remember what I agreed with and what I didn't agree with. 6 7 A moment ago you said that you disagreed 8 with some of the language that he used, but you 9 agreed that there would be multiple factors that go 10 into variation between immigration judges. 11 what you testified to here a few minutes ago. 12 That's correct. Used the word "stew," but Α. 13 we write colloquially because we write for public 14 consumption. 15 Okay. And just to turn back to the German Ο. 16 publication for a minute, you said that the 17 publication came about when they reached out to you. 18 Do you know how you might have been on a 19 list of folks that the German publishers, how they 20 knew about you? 21 I have no idea. I may have been referred 22 by someone with whom I've worked before in the past. 2.3 Okay. Do you remember who? Q.

Michael Dougherty, is that

24

25

Α.

Ο.

I believe that it was Michael Dougherty.

D-o-u-g-h-e-r-t-y?

2.2

- A. That's correct. Again, it's been a while.

 I think that's how they got in touch with me.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you.

Let's turn back to your report here, and I'm going to ask you to turn to paragraph 36, which is on page eight, if you can, please.

MR. SCHULTZ: And Scott, I didn't ask you, but do you have a copy of that expert report from your own expert there in front of you?

MR. ST. JOHN: I do. And I think, like

Mr. Arthur, I don't have all of the attachments.

I've got kind of the core report.

MR. SCHULTZ: Okay. That's fine. These questions I'm going to have now are of the core report. I just want to make sure that you have that in front of you. Right?

MR. ST. JOHN: I do.

MR. SCHULTZ: Thank you so much, Scott.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

Q. Judge Arthur, let's turn to paragraph 36.

That's again on page eight. And you wrote there,

quote, "But during the Biden administration, DHS has

'persistently underutilized its existing resources'

and further sought 'a dramatic reduction in

Case 6:22-cv-01130-DCJ-CBW Document 214-19 Filed 12/22/23 Page 63 of 315 Page D #: Page 63 1 detention, bed capacity' despite surging numbers of 2 migrants." 3 Did I read that correctly? 4 Α. That's correct, Counsel. 5 So let me ask you a few questions about Ο. 6 that then. 7 Does the IFR itself actually call for 8 having the country, quote, "persistently underutilize 9 its existing resources"? With respect to expanding the opportunities 10 11 for parole for individuals who are subjects to 12 credible fear determinations, before those credible 13 fear determinations, yes, it does, in my opinion. 14 Ο. I don't mean to cut you off. Are you all 15 set there? Yes, sir. 16 Α. 17 0. Okay. So you see parole as a resource; is 18 that what you're saying? 19 Parole is not a resource. The case in Α. 20 question was Texas versus United States. The IFR 21 changes the parole standard for aliens who are subject to credible fear determinations to extended 2.2 2.3 to instances where detention is not in the interest

That same "detention is not in the interest

24

25

of the United States.

of the United States" language, it has been used a lot during the Biden administration to release aliens where there is a lack of detention space, notwithstanding the fact there still is detention space.

I believe that that statement was included in the Supreme Court's brief in Texas versus Biden.

I also believe that the -- that that regulation is ultra vires.

- Q. Okay. Let's stick with the resources. So it's not the parole that you're saying is a resource so much as you're saying it's unused detention space; is that what you're calling a resource?
 - A. That's correct.

2.2

2.3

- Q. Okay. Thank you. So let's go a little bit further there. Are you aware of any legal limitations on detaining families in the United States?
- A. I am. The Florida settlement agreement in a case called Flores versus Lynch, there was a court order that was issued in August of 2015 by Judge Dolly Gee, who is district court judge in California, and that was affirmed in part but not in whole by the 9th circuit in July of 2016.

But I would note that even after that,

Page 65 1 there was family detention that was used in Karnes 2 and Dilly. In fact, when I was an immigration judge, 3 I had jurisdiction over a family immigration court that was prior to Flores -- family detention center. 4 5 So you are aware of some limits that the Ο. 6 law imposes on detaining families, correct? 7 Α. I am, Counsel. MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Calls for -- you 8 9 can answer. 10 THE WITNESS: I am, Counsel. 11 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 12 Q. Thank you. So even if there are physical 13 unused detention spaces, sometimes the government is 14 not allowed to use that given these limits on 15 detaining families, right? 16 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Calls for a 17 legal conclusion. 18 You can answer. 19 THE WITNESS: When I visited, I believe it 20 was either Karnes or Dilly --21 BY MR. SCHULTZ: I'm sorry, just -- given the objection, 2.2 Q. 23 given the speaking objection there, let me ask the 24 And then Scott, your objection is noted,

and then let's get a clean record here on this.

Page 66 1 Okay? 2 So even if the United States has detention 3 space that's physical, that's unused, there is still 4 legal limits that can prevent the United States from 5 using that, given the limits on family detention, 6 right? 7 Scott, your objection is noted? 8 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Calls for a 9 legal conclusion. Vague and misleading. BY MR. SCHULTZ: 10 11 Ο. You can answer. 12 Α. I'm sorry? 13 You can answer the question. Ο. 14 I apologize. I thought you said "good 15 answer, " which sort of surprised me. 16 With respect to that, again, the federal 17 government has the opportunity to detain families 18 during that 20-day period when the credible fear 19 determination can be made. 20 And from my personal experience visiting 21 family detention, they were able to utilize that space; however, the Biden administration made the 22 2.3 decision not to detain alien families and I believe that that was effective as of December 2021. 24

I'm not sure that answered my question, so

25

Ο.

Page 67 1 I'm going to try once more. 2 Even if there's unused detention space, if 3 the government -- if the courts say it's not legal 4 for the government to use it, the government can't 5 use it, right? 6 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Calls for 7 testimony about a question of law. Vague. 8 Misleading. 9 THE WITNESS: They can use it up to that 10 20-day period. But yes, thereafter, they 11 cannot. With respect to the children, the 9th 12 circuit decision in Flores versus Lynch, I 13 believe it was, said that they could continue to detain the adults in the family unit thereafter. 14 15 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 16 So you testified you have a law degree, Q. 17 right, Judge? 18 I do, sir. Α. 19 And you told me before that you're being Q. 20 paid for your expertise in part -- I'm sorry, you 21 told me before that you're being paid by the State of Louisiana for your expertise in immigration law, 2.2 23 right? 24 Α. That's correct.

Objection. Asked and

MR. ST. JOHN:

1 answered.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

- Q. There was crosstalk there.
- A. That's correct, Counsel. I didn't hear what you said. I apologize.
- Q. Thank you. All I said was there was crosstalk, so I waited for you to answer, which you just did. So thank you.

Your report is full of legal conclusions, isn't it?

- A. There are applications of facts to law therein.
- Q. Okay. So when I'm asking you to talk about something that's applying to law as something you said, I think that's fair game here. So thank you.

So let's move over to paragraph 42 of your report. That's going to be on page ten. And tell me once you have that open, if you can, please.

- A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. Thank you. So in paragraph 42, it says, in paragraph 42 you wrote, "I believe Congress specifically gave jurisdiction over asylum applications filed by UACs to AOs because Congress recognized that those AOs otherwise lacked the power to adjudicate such asylum applications filed by

Page 69 1 UACs." 2 Did I read those words correctly? 3 Α. That is correct, Counsel. 4 Ο. Okay. And by UAC, do you mean 5 unaccompanied children or sometimes folks use that to mean unaccompanied alien children? 6 7 Α. Unaccompanied alien children is the 8 statutory definition. And AO is the asylum officer. 9 Ο. Thank you. And the TVPRA you talked about in that same paragraph is the Trafficking Victims 10 11 Protection Reauthorization Act, correct? 12 The William Wilberforce Α. Yes, sir. 13 Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008. 14 15 So when you talking in that paragraph about 16 your belief, can you tell me what evidence you have 17 for that belief, please? 18 I was one of the drafters of section Α. 19 451(b) of the INA, which specifically delegated as of 20 March 1, 2003, certain responsibilities that had 21 previously been held by the former INS and vis-a-vis 2.2 the former or the executive office for immigration 2.3 review. 24 And my conclusion is the Congress

determined, having done legislative drafting in the

past, that they had to carve out that exception to exclude children from the credible fear process in Section 235(b)(1) of the INA. When I say INA, I mean the Immigration and Nationality Act.

- Q. Thank you. Have you ever been elected to Congress, sir?
 - A. Never.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. And were you in Congress when that change that you mentioned in paragraph ten was made?
 - A. I was not.
- Q. And you said you drafted Section 451(b) of the INA; is that right?
- A. I assisted as a staffer in the drafting of it. In Congress, we differentiate between drafting of legislation and the actual presentation of legislation, so I did that for the House Judiciary Committee.
- Q. Is section 451(b) of the INA the same as 8USC, Section 1225(b)(3)(c)?
 - A. It is not, Counsel.
- Q. So when you said that you had drafted a section of the INA when you were in Congress, that has nothing to do with what you wrote about in paragraph ten here, right?
 - A. It does, because section 451(b) of the INA

2.2

2.3

Page 71

designated certain responsibilities over certain cases. And I concluded that that was a necessary carveout to make clear that those children, rather than going to immigration judges under section 235(b)(2)of the INA or 235(b)(1) of the INA, that the primary jurisdiction over the asylum claims should be retained by the asylum officers.

Q. I misspoke a moment ago. I said page ten -- I said paragraph ten, I should have said page ten. I'm referring to paragraph 42.

Is that your understanding still that I'm talking about paragraph 42?

- A. That is correct. I will note also,

 Counsel, that when I was with the judiciary

 committee, I had met with individuals who were in the

 process of drafting what would become the William

 Wilberforce Act, though we did not discuss that

 particular issue.
- Q. Did any member of Congress ever tell you that it was their understanding -- that they have the same understanding as what you put in paragraph 42?
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
 - Q. Not that you're aware of or no?
- A. I would remember it, but I can't tell you dispositively I've never had that discussion.

Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. I might have heard reference to it in testimony. So if the question is, did any member of Congress ever speak to me directly? The answer would probably be no.
- Q. And do you know what testimony that might have been contained in?
- A. There was testimony in the Senate, and I believe that it was a panel that included Joseph Edlow, who would have been the prior head of USCIS.
- Q. Did you cite to that in paragraph 42 of your expert report?
 - A. I did not.
 - Q. Why not?
- A. Because, again, I'm -- I just want to answer your question as fully as possible. I don't have an independent recollection of it.

I do know that Ms. Feinstein said in -- the late senator, Dianne Feinstein, of California, had spoken about it and I can't remember whether there was a discussion about it or not.

- Q. Okay. When you said she spoke about it, do you remember what context?
- A. I do not. I remember that she was specifically referencing the TBPRA in that and that

there had been discussion of that particular act during the hearing.

- Q. But you have no citation to that, do you?
- A. No, I don't. I can't even tell you what month or year that was.
- Q. Thank you. So let's go to another paragraph here. Let's go to paragraph 49. And this is the entire paragraph. I'm going to read it out loud.

"The resulting Biden administration policies, including the asylum IFR, are perceived around the world as an announcement that the U.S. borders are now open."

Did I read that correctly?

- A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. You don't have any citation to that paragraph there, do you? That's a yes-or-no question.

MR. ST. JOHN: You can answer it in the form you choose, Mr. Arthur.

THE WITNESS: It's generally accepted that the Biden administration policies, amongst experts in immigration, do in fact do that, but I do not have a citation to that specifically.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

2.5

Q. Why didn't -- if it's so generally noted, why didn't you find a citation?

2.2

2.3

- A. Because it's generally noted that -- I would reference in particular the testimony of then Border Patrol Chief Ortiz in Florida versus United States in various statements that have been made by other individuals in the border patrol thereafter.
- Q. And we'll turn to the Ortiz point in a moment.

You say "perceived around the world."

That's a very broad statement, isn't it, "around the world"?

A. It is, but it's one that I believe is correct because we've seen a huge influx in the entry of migrants from countries that we didn't traditionally see them from.

As recently as FY 2007, the majority of migrants apprehended by border patrol after entering illegally at the southwest border from Mexico. We saw that change in FY 2014 to where nationals of the central triangle countries, so El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, actually made up a majority.

But we still saw very low levels of immigration from the rest of the world. Border patrol actually keeps statistics on the nationalities

of the individuals that it apprehends.

Q. Thank you.

2.2

2.3

- A. Since the Biden administration has taken office, we've seen an expansion to individuals from countries that we did not traditionally see them from in Africa, Eastern Europe, Asia, and other countries in South America that were not typically countries that we saw people from.
- Q. Is there any surveys you know about where people have documented what their views of the Biden administration's policies are that you could have cited but didn't?
- A. Well, I know that Chief Ortiz alluded to them in his deposition. I read a lot of newspaper articles. This is what I do for a living.
- Q. I specifically asked about surveys, not newspaper articles. Any surveys that you're aware of that show people's perception, since you used the word "perceived"?
- A. I based it upon the newspaper articles that I have reviewed, statements that I have seen.
 - Q. What are those newspaper articles, please?
- A. I've seen reference to such things in national newspapers. Also to -- generally, I read them online. Part of my job is to read newspaper

2.2

2.3

Page 76

articles every day, read analyses every day. I can't cite you to a specific one.

- Q. So even though you read those newspaper articles every day and even though you read analyses every day and even though you say that these surveys exist, you decided not to put that as a citation to footnote in paragraph 49, correct?
- A. It's so generally accepted, I did not believe that it required reference.
- Q. Does anyone disagree with that that you've ever read about in all of those newspaper articles or analyses?
- A. The Biden administration in particular cites to conditions around the world, geopolitical conditions is the term that Judge T. Kent Wetherell, II used in Florida versus United States.

And when I refer to the Biden administration, I'm referring specifically to the White House, where they talk about root causes of immigration.

And I do see people that offer contrary views in connection with that. It is my -- it is my conclusion, based upon the survey that I've read, and it's generally accepted that the Biden administration policies are a pull factor, drawing people to the

United States.

2.2

2.3

Q. Let's put aside pull factor for a moment. We'll get to that. But just to make sure I understand what you're saying.

What you're saying is that it's generally accepted around the world that the Biden policies are seen as an announcement that the U.S. borders are open and the only -- with all of the reading of newspaper articles and analyses that you read every day, the only descent that you've seen from that is from the Biden administration and more specifically from the White House; is that your testimony here under oath today?

MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: Just to clarify the statement that you made, generally accepted within the United States amongst immigration experts that they create a pull factor. There are differing views, but it is generally accepted that that is a pull factor.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

Q. So now you're modifying what you wrote where you said perceived around the world, to what you said a moment ago where you said it's only within

Page 78 1 the United States. Is that what you're now 2 testifying to? 3 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Misleading. THE WITNESS: The generally accepted, 4 5 Counsel, is within the United States that those 6 policies are perceived around the world as a 7 pull factor, as an announcement that the U.S. 8 border is now open. 9 BY MR. SCHULTZ: You spoke to one source for that as the 10 0. 11 deposition of Mr. Ortiz; is that right? 12 That is correct. Α. 13 So when he testified in that deposition, do you know if he did so as an expert or in his own 14 15 personal capacity? 16 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Misleading. 17 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 18 It's a question. Do you know if he Q. 19 testified as an expert or in his own personal 20 capacity? 21 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Misleading. 2.2 Counsel, that is not a binary choice. You're 23 not even presenting the correct option. 24 MR. SCHULTZ: That's a speaking objection. 25 Thank you.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

2.2

- Q. You can answer the question, please.
- A. He was testifying in his capacity as the chief of the border patrol.
 - Q. Okay.

MR. ST. JOHN: Counsel, I will not tolerate -- the state will not tolerate misleading questions like that. That is not square ball.

MR. SCHULTZ: Counsel, there is no question before the witness right now. You've made your objection.

MR. ST. JOHN: I've made my objection and I'm informing opposing counsel that trying to mislead the witness is not square ball. And if it continues, that is absolutely something we'll get the court on the phone for.

Do not -- please do not ask a question A or B, when you know that C is the correct answer.

And please don't pretend that the people in that room right there did not know the capacity Chief Ortiz was testifying in.

MR. SCHULTZ: Are you giving -- anything else to say here, Scott?

MR. ST. JOHN: I've made my record.

Page 80 1 MR. SCHULTZ: Would you like to keep speaking? 3 MR. ST. JOHN: I will make objections as I need to, and if this continues, we will 4 5 absolutely get the court on the phone. MR. SCHULTZ: I'm just asking if you're 6 7 done? 8 MR. ST. JOHN: I've made my objection, 9 Counsel. 10 MR. SCHULTZ: Very good. 11 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 12 So turning back to paragraph 49, do you Ο. 13 conduct any of your own research, any of your own 14 primary research, Judge Arthur, on the perception of 15 the Biden administration policies around the world? 16 Α. I do, in fact, go to the border and I do speak to individuals at the border. 17 18 Q. What languages do you speak, sir? 19 Α. I speak English. 20 Okay. Do you speak to the people coming Q. 21 across the border in English? 22 I have spoken to individuals in the 2.3 communities in which those individuals are being released. 24 25 What communities are those? Ο.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Page 81

- A. I've been all around the border. I've been to Yuma, Arizona; El Paso, Texas; the Rio Grande Valley, and that's just, I believe, this year.
- Q. Okay. But you didn't cite to any of that research in your expert report, did you?
- A. That is correct. I will note that my colleague, Todd Bensman, does actually go to the other side of the border and he does take a translator with him who is fluent in Spanish and able to speak Spanish, and he regularly writes on those subjects as well.
 - Q. Can you spell his name, please?
- A. B-e-n-s-m-a-n, all one word. And Todd,
 T-o-d-d.
 - Q. Do you cite to his research anywhere in this expert report?
 - A. I may. I'd have to look at the whole thing.
 - Q. Did you cite to it in reference to paragraph 49?
 - A. I did not, Counsel.
 - Q. So you could have, but you didn't, right?
 - A. Again, it's generally accepted that that is the perception around the world.
 - Q. Okay. So you talk about Biden policies.

Am I saying that right, policies, plural?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. So that means more than one policy, right?
- A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. Please tell me the names or at least the substance of the policies that you have in mind now. Please list them for me.
- A. Sure. The ending of the Migrant Protection Protocols, MPP, which is commonly known as Remain in Mexico, ending the policy of detaining individuals who enter in what are called family units or FMUs, the CBP One application program, which was announced in a White House press release on January 5th.

There are other policies that are contained therein, but the general policy of not detaining aliens and following a very different -- parole plus ATD.

- Q. I'm sorry, you used and acronym there. Parole plus?
 - A. That's what it's called, parole plus ATD.
 - O. Adam Thomas --
 - A. Alpha Tango David.
- Q. Thank you.
 - A. And I'm trying to think of some more.

 Changing the release policies that had been

followed by previous administrations, including the Trump and Obama administrations.

- Q. Are there any other Biden administration policies that have been implemented that made you think that people around the world have a perception that the Biden administration has opened the borders?
- A. They all very much tie together with respect to the opportunity for release and the opportunity to work in the United States.
 - Q. And I appreciate that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- A. There was an EO that was issued February 2nd, I think it was, 2021. I don't have the number, but it talked about how it was going to change the policies of the prior administration.
- Q. So you said EO, that means executive order; is that right?
 - A. That's correct, sir.
 - Q. And you said February 22nd, it was issued?
 - A. February 2, 2021.
- Q. February 2, 2021. Changed the policies of former administration; that's what you said?
- A. The former administration. And I would reference also President Biden's election website. I can't remember what it was called. They've actually pulled it down. It's got a picture of President

Biden with glowing red eyes now, but it was -- I believe it was the Biden plan for -- I can't remember.

2.2

2.3

- Q. That was an election website, correct?
- A. It was an election website, but we saw a huge uptick directly after President Biden took office, you know, in connection with statements he made, including statements he made on that website.
- Q. Is there anything else that you can think of that speaks to what you wrote in paragraph 49 about resulting -- about Biden administration policies that are perceived around the world as an announcement that the U.S. borders are now opened?
- A. Yeah. Guidelines that were issued by Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas on September 30th, 2021. Sometimes it's referred to as the priorities memo. I don't want to paraphrase what he said, but he stated that unlawful presence in the United States was not sufficient to take an enforcement action, in and of itself. Again, I don't want to paraphrase.
- Q. That was the guidelines from Secretary of Homeland Security, Mayorkas, from September 31st; is that what you said?
- A. September 30th. I don't think there is a 31st.

Q. I apologize.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

A. That's quite all right. I make that mistake all the time. I have to rewrite checks.

I can't remember the exact name of it, but it's known as the guidelines of the priority memo.

It's the document that was at issue in Texas versus United States.

- Q. Okay. Is there anything else that you can think of that are Biden administration policies that have led to the perception around the world as an announcement that the U.S. borders are now open?
- A. Those are the ones that come to mind. I'll tell you if I come up with something else.
- Q. And if during the rest of this deposition, if anything else comes to mind, please do let me know.
 - A. Sure.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you.

Now, you had mentioned pull factors a moment ago, correct?

- A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. And just give me a moment. I'm going to bring it up in a little bit, but let me see if it makes sense to do it now. If you don't mind indulge me for a moment, please.

How about this: In paragraph 43, this is kind of related to what we were just saying, I'm going to read you something you wrote there. This is paragraph 43, page ten. It looks like it's two sentences.

It says, "President Biden took office on January 20, 2021. That same day he issued multiple executive orders related to immigration and border policy, with yet more following in the subsequent months."

Did I read that correctly in paragraph 43?

- A. That is correct.
- Q. Can you tell me, please, either by name or by substance, what those executive orders were?
 - A. I would --

2.2

MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Best evidence rule.

MR. SCHULTZ: My question is what does he think of as those -- that's my question, what's in his head. I'm going to ask that question again.

Are you done with your objection, Scott?

MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Best evidence rule.

You can answer, Judge Arthur.

202-857-3376

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I would need to look at the document again to refresh my recollection with respect to what they were. There was also a memo that was issued by the acting head of DHS, whose name escapes me at the moment, that actually placed a moratorium on removals from the United States.

That was issued almost immediately after President Biden was sworn in. It's -- let me just see. Yes, I'd have to take a look at the document to remember what all they were. He's issued a lot of executive orders.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

2.2

2.3

- Q. Any other way of trying to specify what those might be that you can recall from your own memory right now?
 - A. I cannot, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. But did you have some of those in mind when you wrote that report, when you wrote paragraph 43 of your report?
 - A. I did, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. So let's maybe work on the -- let's approach the pull factors this way: Let's turn to page 12 here. And there's a subheading there I'm going to read that's between paragraphs 49 and 50.

Page 88 1 It says, "Migrant flows are responsive to policy." 2 Do you see those words that you wrote? 3 Α. I do, Counsel. And did I read those correctly? 4 Q. 5 You did, Counsel. Α. Okay. So let's look to the next paragraph, 6 Q. 7 paragraph 50. There's a couple of sentences I'm 8 going to read there. 9 Actually, let's stick with that subheading. You used the phrase migrant flow. What is migrant 10 11 flow? 12 Migrant flow is a generally accepted term Α. 13 that refers to an increase, decrease, or steady flow 14 of migrants into the United States illegally or 15 without proper documents at the borders. 16 Q. Okay. And you didn't make up that phrase 17 then, did you? 18 That's a common phrase, commonly used Α. No. 19 phrase. 20 Q. Okay. And then you say, are responsive to 21 policy. 2.2 In that context, can you tell me what you 23 meant by responsive? 24 Α. Sure. 25 Q. And I'll just note for the record, you seem 2.2

2.3

Page 89

to be frozen, both of you. Now you're unfrozen. The visual doesn't matter, just that it might be a foreshadowing that there might be an audio problem.

I didn't actually hear an audio problem, though.

- A. It was actually you that was frozen in that particular instance.
- Q. I think it was each of us, depending where we sat.
- A. It is -- again, I've been in this field for 30 years. And over that 30-year period, I have seen the implementation of policies that have either increased the flow of migrants illegally into the United States or decreased them.

The most significant one that I can think of was the election of Donald Trump in January of 2017. We saw a decline when President Trump took office. That decline didn't last long. It lasted about four months and we started to see the numbers of individuals entering the United States illegally tick up after that.

I've written a lot about this, and I think

I've even used the term Trump effect. I borrowed the

term Biden effect with respect to a flow that we saw

shortly after President Biden took office, when we

saw the number of aliens who entered the United

States illegally increase directly thereafter.

2.2

2.3

Another policy that affected the migrant flow was what I referred to before, the migrant protection protocols or MPP. MPP was implemented in a phase stage, and when it was fully implemented it caused a decline in the migrant flow across the border. DHS actually did an assessment of that in October 2019.

- Q. Okay. So when folks talk about migrant flows, that seems to get into areas of demography. Are you a demographer?
- A. I'm sorry, how does it get into issues of demography?
- Q. It seems to me it's about where people are and where they're going. It's about people being not in one place but instead in another place.

My only question is, do you have a degree in demography?

- A. No, Counsel. We've gone over my academic pedigree. I do not, but I for decades have dealt with the flow of individuals into the United States and the way that they come to the United States.
- Q. Okay. And let me read the first sentence of paragraph 50. It's right below that subheading. It says, "Migrant flows are responsive to policy in

generally predictable ways." Next sentence says,

"That follows from the basic economic premise that

demand increases when the cost or burden of

something -- here, the likelihood of detention or

removal -- is reduced, or the likely gain -- here,

release into the interior of the United States, with

employment authorization following in short order -
is increased."

Did I read that correctly?

A. You did, Counsel.

2.2

2.3

- Q. Okay. So when you say "predictable ways," what do you mean by that?
- A. Depending on whether the policy makes it more or less likely that the individual will be detained vis-a-vis being released into the United States. Most of the individuals who come to the United States pay a smuggler to bring them at least part of the way into this country. And they have to make an economic investment in that smuggler when that happens, and they want to see a return on their investment.

Part of the reason why Remain in Mexico was effective was because --

Q. I'm not asking about Remain in Mexico right now.

2.2

2.3

Page 92

A. I'm sorry, I was just giving you an example of this. I wanted to be clear for the record.

But yeah, when the likelihood that an individual is going to be released into the United States and be able to live and work here or potentially gain status here or remain here indefinitely, the flow increases.

- Q. Okay. So that first sentence when you talk about generally predictable ways, there is no footnote, is there?
- A. There is not, Counsel. Again, it's generally accepted that that's how the border works.
- Q. When you say it's generally accepted, do you mean there is authority that you could have cited, you just decided not to?
- A. No, it's one of those things that's so commonly accepted, it doesn't really require a footnote or citation.
- Q. Okay. So you told me before that you -when you were at the University of Virginia and
 studied in Charlottesville, you had a concentration
 in economics and except for statistics, you were one
 class short for qualifying for a degree in economics,
 right?
 - A. That is correct.

- Q. Do you remember when you were at the University of Virginia, did you ever study the economics of migration?
 - A. I did not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Okay. Do you have any academic training in the economics of migration?
- A. I have 30 years of experience in it. But with respect to academic degrees, I do not.
- Q. Okay. And not just academic degrees, do you have any academic training at all -- academic training at all in the economics of migrations movement?
- A. The economic experience that I have is through the classes that I attended at the university of Virginia and it did not involve migration.
- Q. Thank you. Do you know if there are people, academics who study the economics of migration movement?
- A. There are individuals who do have that field of study, yes.
 - Q. Okay. But you're not one of them?
- A. I am a person who has gained my experience in this through practical experience, not through academic experience.
 - Q. Okay. And this is a bit of a paraphrase,

Page 94 1 but tell me if this is a fair paraphrase. 2 looking at paragraph 50. Let me see if I can think 3 of a better way to ask this. One moment, please. 4 Thanks. One of the -- tell me if this is fair or 5 6 not, and if it's not, then please try to fix it. 7 Is it fair to say in paragraph 50 that 8 you're saying that the likelihood of detention or 9 removal being decreased is something in your opinion 10 that migrant flow responds to? 11 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. The report 12 speaks for itself. 13 You can answer. 14 THE WITNESS: Yes, I would. 15 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 16 Okay. Thank you. Ο. 17 And I could give you examples if you'd Α. 18 like, Counsel. 19 Q. I might ask you for that, but not quite 20 But thank you for that offer. 21 We certainly saw it after Judge Gee issued 22 her order in 2015 --2.3 No question pending, but thank you. Q. 24 Α. I apologize. 25 So how does that mechanism work? How, in Ο.

your experience, does a likelihood of detention somehow affect migrant flow? Can you walk me through, please, the steps on how that reaches the people whose -- who are part of that migrant flow?

2.2

2.3

A. Oh, yeah. It happens in a couple of ways. Part of it is through word of mouth by individuals who have gotten to the United States who have been released into this country where they can live or work.

Part of it is the sales pitch that the smugglers themselves offer. And in fact, I think President Biden alluded to this during statements he made in Guatemala City in June of 2014, with respect to -- when he was vice president, of course -- with respect to smugglers explaining to people how they are able to come to the United States and the likelihood that they're going to be released into this country. Foreign media sometimes carries information about these things.

- Q. Okay. And does the IFR, in your opinion, lead to a --
- A. In fact, Counsel, I do need to -- at one point, I believe that Secretary Mayorkas may have chided individuals, elected representatives who were talking about the border being open, because it would

2.2

2.3

Page 96

encourage additional individuals to enter the United States, when he asserted that the border was not open.

- Q. Okay. In your view, is the IFR something that decreases the likelihood of detention or removal?
- A. It does, by its face, because it lowers the standard for parol for individuals who are pending a credible fear determination.

We certainly saw in December of 2009 then ICE director, John Warden, issued a directive to allow individuals who had passed credible fear to be paroled into the United States.

And we saw -- up to that point in the years before that, four years before that, we had seen somewhere around 4 to 5 percent of individuals who were subject to credible -- subject to expedited removal make credible fear claims.

After Secretary --

- Q. Just to be clear, you're talking about Secretary Morton in 2009, correct?
 - MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Counsel, the witness is answering. He gets to --
 - MR. SCHULTZ: The question was about the IFR, which was long after 2009.

THE WITNESS: Right, Counsel, but I'm explaining to you how the availability of parol with respect to --

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

2.2

2.3

- Q. That wasn't my question. My question was not about the availability of parol. My question was specifically about the IFR.
- A. Again, we can look back at past experience to see that the opportunity for parole for individuals, the expansion of parol for individuals does increase the number of individuals who will come to the border and make credible fear claims.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And I apologize, Counselor. I don't mean to offend you.
- Q. There is no offense. There's just a lot of ground to cover today, and as I'm sure you know, there's a limited amount of time. I do have some questions about parole, which we might get to later on. That question was just about the IFR. So thank you so much.
- A. Thank you. Plus the availability of asylum, because this is the IFR. If individuals are granted the asylum more quickly through this process, whether they should be granted or not, whether it's

easy to get asylum before an asylum officer than it is before an immigration judge, it will in fact encourage other individuals to come to the United States to take advantage of that process.

- Q. Now let's get into the phrase you used a moment ago. You talked about a pull factor. Did you use that phrase a few minutes ago?
 - A. I did, Counselor.

2.2

2.3

- Q. You're also familiar with something else that's called a push factor that's related to a pull factor?
 - A. Yes, Counselor.
- Q. Can you tell me as quickly as possible just what those terms, pull factor and push factor, mean?

 It's a bit of a tongue twister. I apologize.
- A. Sure. Pull factors are factors that encourage people to come to the United States because of things that are happening in the United States.

Push factors are factors that are unique to the countries in which those individuals come that encourage them to come to this country or to leave home or to go anywhere else. Push factors and pull factors are generally accepted to be fairly common within migration, generally.

Q. And do both pull and push factors lead

people to migrate?

2.2

2.3

- A. Both push factors and pull factors do lead people to migrate.
- Q. Okay. And do pull and push factors lead people to migrate to the United States of America?
- A. Yes, in differing degrees depending on the strength of the pull factor and the strength of the push factor.
- Q. Okay. So can you tell me, please, if there are any push factors that you can think about, please -- that you can name, please.
- A. Certainly. Generally accepted push factors are economic conditions in the home country, political conditions in the home country, war in the home country, crime, disorder, violence. Did I mention corruption before? Corruption is one that is identified.
- Q. Thank you. You had not. That was not a repeat. Corruption was not mentioned before. Thank you.
- A. Those are ones that the Biden administration has specifically cited.
- Q. What about you, from your experience? Any other push factors aside from what the Biden administration has or hasn't said?

2.2

2.3

Page 100

A. Again, I've been involved in this for three decades, plus. With respect to push factors, I can remember times in history, including civil wars in Guatemala and El Salvador, in which we didn't see the same level of individuals coming to this country from those countries as we have of late.

I can, you know, think of other conditions of violence in other countries, certainly the rise of Hugo Ch vez in Venezuela. He's not currently the president. He's the former president. That we did not see large numbers of Venezuelans come to the United States. We would generally see those relocate within other countries.

- Q. I don't think you said this before, but now that you mentioned Venezuela, can famine be a push factor?
- A. I believe the term that is used is food insecurity. And with respect to that as a push factor, it can either lead to internal relocation or relocation to a nearby country.
- Q. So it can lead to some sort of migrant flow though; is that right?
 - A. It can lead to a migrant flow.
- Q. Okay. What about COVID? Obviously that's very recent in human history, but can COVID be a push

factor?

2.2

2.3

- A. Actually, COVID is sort of a negative push factor because most borders shut down their -- most countries shut down their borders in response to COVID or put restrictions on individuals to transit to the United States or, you know, even to transit to nearby countries. So with respect to that, it's sort of a mixed bag.
- Q. But border closures aren't always a factor that governments might hope they'd be, right?
- A. Depends on the government, depends on the border.
- Q. I don't think you mentioned educational opportunities. Is that something else that can be a push factors?
- A. Yes. Educational opportunities in the United States can be a pull factor with respect to the educational opportunities in the country in question. That's sort of a comparison factor.
- Q. Something like education might be both a push and a pull factor; a bad education in their home country might be pushing them and a good education here might be pulling them. Is that a fair --
- A. Yes, but in most countries, the -- again, from my experience, the level of education is static.

2.2

2.3

Page 102

It's not quite -- it's not quite the factor that food insecurity would be, because again, that's -- education is more of a pull factor than a push factor.

Q. Okay. I mean, I'm not sure much rides on it. I suppose all I'm thinking is if education were equal in two countries, it wouldn't be a factor.

So if it's worse in one country and better in another, it seems that the bad education is doing the pushing and the good education is doing the pulling, right?

- A. I would define that as a pull factor, again, because there are educational systems in most countries of differing degrees. So, you know, the opportunity for better education in the United States would be more of a pull factor.
- Q. Okay. Thanks for clarifying and talking that through.

So you said before that both push factors and pull factors can lead to migrant flows, right?

- A. That is correct, sir.
- Q. Okay. So what are some of the pull factors then? You mentioned education. What are some of the other pull factors?
 - A. Education, economic opportunities, general

security. Economics is really the biggest one.

Comparing the daily rate for unskilled workers.

2.2

2.3

And I did this at one point a couple of years ago. It's about a ten-to-one differential between Central America and the United States and about an eight-to-one differential between Mexico and the United States. So, you know, economic opportunities is really the biggest one.

Reunification with family is a pull factor. Better education, if I didn't say that already, is a pull factor.

Q. We did talk about the education. Thank you.

Okay. So in your report, in your expert report, do you talk about any methodology that you or others might have used to kind of differentiate between the force of different pull and push factors?

A. So I look at -- in the past, I've looked at -- in my report, no, but from my experimental -- again, these are generally accepted things.

I examine the country's conditions in various countries around the world and compare them to previous periods of time when we had large -- when we -- compare them to the migrant flow from those countries in the past.

Q. You said you have 30 years of experience looking at migrant flows; is that right?

2.2

2.3

A. I have 30 years of experience in immigration law. I certainly had the opportunity to examine migrant flows beginning in September of 1994 when I became a trial attorney in San Francisco.

San Francisco had an international airport and we had a lot of people who would come through the international airport and a lot of people who would make their way to San Francisco.

Certainly when I was in Baltimore, I saw very different flows. We had an international airport there as well. When I was in the general counsel's office at the INS, again, these were issues that I had to deal with on a regular basis.

I was on both the enforcement and the national security teams serially. And certainly when I was on the hill as oversight counsel for immigration for house judiciary and as staff director of the national security subcommittee and house oversight and government reform, I certainly saw it come through my corporate.

Q. In all of that experience, have you come across any methodologies for giving different weights to different pull and push factors?

A. With respect to academic?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Let's start with academic. Sure.
- A. I assume there may be some. I've never had the opportunity to see them.
- Q. Okay. Did you talk about them in your expert report?
- A. I did not, because they may exist; I'm not familiar with them.
- Q. So you said, "Do you mean academic?" I said, "Let's start with that."

Aside from academic models, are there any other practical models that you've seen that have a methodology for distinguishing the force of different pull and push factors, even if not from academic, something that is a recognized methodology, though? Anything come to mind?

- A. Mine is experiential.
- Q. But and is that something that you've reduced in any way to a formula or a flow chart or anything that again shows a method, a methodology?
 - A. No, Counsel.
- Q. And that's not in your report, in your expert report here either, is it?
- A. That is correct. I don't cite any flowcharts or methodologies that I created.

Page 106 1 MR. SCHULTZ: Okay. Thank you. Give me 2 one moment here, please. Okay? Thank you. 3 We're going to take a bathroom break for five minutes or so. We'll come back to this 4 5 topic when we're done. 6 What I have here is 12:21, so let's take 7 five and see where we are. 8 (RECESS TAKEN.) 9 BY MR. SCHULTZ: It's 12:30. We're back on the record now. 10 Ο. 11 So let's turn over actually a little bit 12 back to something on paragraph 43, where you wrote in 13 the second sentence that -- I'm sorry, I have the 14 wrong paragraph here. One moment. 15 I believe we were on 49 last time. 16 0. That's right. I am moving to something 17 different here, but let me -- my notes are off. 18 me a second to try to find this. Apologies. 19 Paragraph 46. There we go. If you can go 20 there, please. You're talking there about testimony 21 by Rodney Scott, correct? 2.2 Δ That's correct, Counsel. 2.3 0. Okay. And he was also an expert in this 24 case. Are you aware of that?

Was he an expert in this case?

25

Α.

- Q. Do you know if he's an expert in this case?
- A. I don't know Chief Scott's status in the case.
 - Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- A. I believe he may be an expert, but I'm not 100 percent sure.
- Q. Okay. And one of the quotes you have in there talks about a quote -- about, quote, the administration's laser focus on expediting processing and increasing opportunities for migrants to enter the United States. That's a partial quote. Is that right?
 - A. Yes, it ends with "never waivered."
- Q. Yeah. Okay. Do you know what policies Mr. Scott was talking about there?
- A. He doesn't use the words "policies" in that sentence.
 - Q. Right.
- A. I believe that he was -- with respect to what he was saying, I believe that he was referring to the Biden administration's release policies, protocol into the United States.
- Q. Can you say that once more? I didn't quite catch one of those words.
 - A. The process by which border patrol agents

would speed the processing of individuals and their release into the United States. And again, that was reflected in Florida versus United States.

Q. Okay. And in paragraph 47, also Mr. Scott, he wrote at one point that the Biden, quote, administration has made it very clear deterrence was no longer our mission.

Do you remember putting that in paragraph 47?

- A. Yes, Counsel.
- Q. Do you see that there?
- 12 A. I do, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. And do you agree with that?
 - A. With respect to the degree that Chief Scott made that statement, I agree with it. I don't work at border patrol, but that's reflected in the actions of the administration.
 - Q. And it --
 - A. Certainly in Judge Wetherell's decision.
 - Q. When you say the acts of the administration, what do you mean?
 - A. I'm sorry?
 - Q. You said "reflected in the actions of the administration," and I asked you to please say what you meant.

2.3

Page 109

A. Sure. With respect to processing migrants out of custody and releasing them into the United States.

In fact, that was actually a key point in,

I believe, Florida versus Mayorkas. Again, Judge

Wetherell's decision in that matter.

- Q. And besides Mr. Scott's testimony, do you have any support for what he said?
- A. Chief Scott actually sent a letter to
 Senate leadership on September 11, 2021, in which he
 talked about the dangers with respect to that. And
 again, it's reflected in the decisions of Judge
 Wetherell in both Florida versus United States and
 Florida versus Mayorkas.
- Q. Okay. So given Mr. Scott's testimony that deterrence was no longer a DHS mission, is that a pull or a push factor?
- A. With respect to deterrence not being a factor, that is a pull factor because it makes it more likely that individuals will successfully enter the United States.
- Q. Let's go over to paragraph 48 then. Tell me once you're there, please.
 - A. I'm here.
 - Q. So to paraphrase, you said that there were

policies -- that there was times -- that there were policies implemented and you wrote that the Biden administration did not consult with the border patrol chief, and you wrote in paragraph 48 that that -- the failure to consult was quote, unquote, shocking; is that right?

A. Yes, that is correct.

2.2

2.3

Q. And do you know what time period we're talking about there?

Let me ask it this way: Is that the time period that's right after the Biden administration took office?

- A. Again, that is -- Chief Scott sent his letter to the Senate September 11, 2021, looking back during the time that he was border patrol chief. He was actually President Biden's first border patrol chief.
- Q. Right. Do you know when that failure to consult took place?
- A. Yeah. He actually discusses it in that letter when he talks about that recommendations from -- I don't have the letter in front of me. I don't want to paraphrase, but recommendation from career employees were ignored and, you know, political appointees ignored them.

2.2

Page 111

Q. Okay. So thank you for that. I am going to ask you to please focus on the question that I asked, which is about the time period.

Do you know what time period he was saying when that failure to consult took place, please?

A. Yeah, he reflects back. Again, the reason that I -- I apologize, he talks about the time that he was border patrol chief in that September 2021 letter.

And you know, the same policies appear to have taken place with respect to internal communications. I relied on Chief Scott's testimony.

- Q. Okay. So again, do you know when that failure to consult took place?
- A. With respect to -- he indicated at the time that that was endemic in the Biden administration while he was chief.
- Q. Okay. So when the Trump administration took over -- so this is back, I guess, January 2017, do you know who the chief of border patrol was back then, starting on inauguration day, let's say?
 - A. I believe it was Mark Morgan.
- Q. And do you know if there was any consultation about policies between the Trump administration and that chief who's name you just

mentioned?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. I didn't serve in the Trump administration.
- Q. So are you saying that you don't know?
- A. I have reason to believe that there was a lot of back-and-forth. I had a lot of access to border patrol agents during that period of time. And I believe that the border patrol chief's advises were taken seriously by the administration.
- Q. So you believe that. Do you have any source for that? Any evidence?
- A. Again, I spoke to border patrol agents.

 When I would go to the border to talk about the policies, I would talk to -- I can't remember. I talked to line agents. I spoke to chiefs. I can't give you specific chiefs in places.
 - Q. Okay. Why do you say that it's shocking?
- A. It's shocking because, again, I served at INS under the Clinton administration, under Attorney General Janet Reno, and input from border patrol was one of those things that not only we at the INS, but all the way up the chain to the attorney general would solicit and listen to.
- Q. Okay. Is the chief of border patrol a political-appointed appointment?
 - A. The chief of border patrol is a term

appointment or is -- I can't remember whether it's Schedule C or not.

Q. Okay. Let's go over to paragraph 58. That's 5-8. And that's going to be on page 15.

Are you there?

- A. I am, Counsel.
- Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- A. You hadn't asked a question, so I wasn't sure what you wanted me to say.
- Q. I wanted to make sure you are there and had everything there in front of you, that you're comfortable before I start the question.

I'm going to read that sentence there.

It's a one-sentence paragraph. "Consistent with and in my opinion based on the perception that U.S. borders are effectively open, migration has surged."

Did I read that accurately?

- A. Correct. That's what it says.
- Q. Okay. So when did that surge start, if you know?
- A. The surge started -- so there was a surge -- there was a deep valley that started with Title 42 in March of 2020, and I believe it reached its nadir in April of 2021 and we started to see numbers going up.

Now, this was during the Trump administration. But the surge that I'm referring to right there was a surge that began in -- primarily in February of 2021 under the Biden administration.

- Q. And how -- what criteria are you using to distinguish between that first surge that you said where the nadir was April 2021 and what you're saying was somehow separate surge in February of 2021?
- A. Based on the monthly apprehension numbers that border patrol publishes.
 - Q. Okay.

2.2

2.3

- A. We started to reach monthly levels that we hadn't seen since 2000 -- since before September 11th.
- Q. Okay. And I might have just written the date wrong in my notes. I apologize. Can you tell me the date again on what you're calling the second surge or separate surge that started later?
- A. I believe it began in February and then it ticked up throughout the year with some peaks and valleys in 20 -- I'm sorry, 2021, and then increased with some peaks and valleys thereafter.
- Q. Okay. So the dates seem to have a bit of tension. Maybe I'm misunderstanding. You said there was a surge in March of 2020, then you --

- A. I apologize, Counsel. What I said was there was a nadir in March of 2020, that it actually reached the nadir in April of 2021 -- 2020. April 2020.
- Q. Thank you. That was my -- that's where we had a disconnect. I think you said April 2021 when you meant to say April 2020.
 - A. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Just to be fair, the nadir was April 2020; is that right?
- A. I believe that might have been one of the lowest months for apprehensions ever.
- Q. I understand. It seemed you had two different dates in 2021.
 - A. I apologize.
- Q. No. No. No. Thank you for clarifying. I just wanted to make sure that my notes were correct.

Okay. So you mentioned peaks and valleys. So when you're talking about a separate or distinct surge, is that based on those peaks and valleys?

A. Well, I'm talking about a surge that commenced beginning in February of 2021, ended -- has remained fairly steady, again, with peaks and valleys. Up until December of 2022, there was a slight decline, another decline in May of 2023

- following the Circumvention of Lawful Pathways Rule.

 Then we seen them tick up again with small monthly fluctuation thereafter.
- Q. Tell me if this is fair to say: There was a nadir in April 2020, and since then, numbers have gone up; is that right?
- A. Right. So after the April 2020, the numbers still remained low, but they were higher than that April of 2020 number.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. Let's go over to paragraph 64.

You have a sentence there -- tell me once you're there, please.

A. I'm there, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Q. Thank you. It says, "The consensus among experts is that publicly released statistics downplay the level of migration and releases into the interior, with aliens improperly excluded from categories and other categories simply not reported.

As Chief Scott testified, it is a shell game."

Is that accurate, what I just read?

- A. It is correct, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Do you agree with what Chief Scott said there?
 - A. I do agree with what Chief Scott said

there.

2.2

2.3

- Q. What do you mean then when you're agreeing with him that there's a shell game?
- A. I agree that it's a shell game because things like the January 5th, 2023, announcement that migrants would be able to access the CBP One app to make appointments at the ports of entry to be released into the United States, really just had an intention of hiding the flow of migrants across the southwest border.

Those individuals are subject to the same inspection protocol in section 235 of the INA.

They're equally inadmissible under section 235 of the INA, and they're subject to the same detention standards; however, they've been portrayed as individuals seeking to enter the United States lawfully.

An individual seeks to enter the United States lawfully when they come to a port of entry with proper documents to enter the United States. Those individuals don't have proper documents.

- Q. Are you saying that the IFR calls for a shell game?
- A. With respect to this, with respect to the Biden administration's policies generally. I would

say the same thing about the CHMV parol program that was implemented that brings 30,000 nationals of Cuban, Haiti, Venezuelan, Nicaraguans to the United States.

Q. You started off that paragraph again by saying that the consensus among experts, then you go on with the language I already read.

Do you see those words?

A. I do, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. You don't have a footnote to any of those experts in that paragraph, do you?
- A. No, I do not. I could certainly give examples with respect to that.

So CBP publishes what's called Custody of Transfer Statistics. One of the data points on that custody and transfer statistics is office of field operations issued an NTA, and then the next two are issued in NTA released, issued in NTA detained.

It's a binary choice and yet the numbers for CBP there shows zero across the board.

- Q. But you haven't named any experts just now, have you?
- A. I'm speaking about other experts in my field, other individuals that I consider to have expertise with respect to this.

- Q. Okay. But you didn't put those names into your report, did you?
 - A. No, I did not.
- Q. Okay. In paragraph 66 you talk about cartels.

Do you see that?

A. I do.

2.2

2.3

- Q. Why did you write about cartels here with -- why are you writing about cartels here?
- A. Because it's very important. Again, I've referenced back to Chief Scott's September 2021 letter to Congress where he talked about how on the other side of the border, individuals associated with the cartels sent -- control the migrant flow so they can create what are called controllable gaps that they then use to send other migrants who don't want to be caught with drugs and other contraband into the United States.

Also, reporting indicates that they charge a PISO or a tax -- Madam Transcriber, P-I-S-O -- with respect to the individuals who come to the United States, if they don't pay that PISO, they're not allowed to cross.

Q. How long have the cartels, in your opinion, been in charge of who can and can't enter the United

States?

2.2

2.3

- A. With respect to this particular flow, it is a rather recent phenomenon in my experience.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. The Mexican government has been at war with the cartels for -- again, war is sort of shorthand, but they've been battling the cartels since the presidency of Vicente Fox back in the early 2000s, and the Mexican government has been attempting to tamp down those organizations.

There was certainly control -- attempted control of narcotics coming into the United States that provided those individuals with money. But a border that is viewed as accessible provides them with an opportunity to make more money and create those controllable gaps.

- Q. During let's say the years of 2017 through December of 2019, did the cartels have power about who was entering the United States?
- A. There was certainly cartel activities on the other side of the border in areas. There was a certain level of cartel activity at that time with respect to controlling their territory.

They would charge fees, basically, to smugglers who would bring those individuals into the

United States.

2.3

- Q. Thank you.
- A. But please understand that with respect to the smugglers, the cartels, normally they're two different groups of individuals. So with respect to that, again, it's sort of a symbiotic relationship. Sometimes it can be an ugly symbiotic relationship.
- Q. Thank you. Go back one notch to paragraph 65, please. One moment, please.

So if you're looking at paragraph, there's a couple -- there's a couple-lines sentence, then a block quote and a line and a half of text that you wrote, so two lines, indent pull quote, then your quote, correct?

- A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. I'm just going to read the stuff that you wrote, not the pull quote. Okay?
 - A. Okay.
- Q. "In recent congressional testimony, I estimated the number of aliens released into the interior of the United States during the Biden administration" -- then you have the pull quote. Then you say, "My calculation based on data released in September 2023 through the end of August is 2,390,584 illegal migrants released."

Did I read your words correctly?

A. You did, Counsel.

2.2

2.3

- Q. And then a 30 and a footnote down to a website, right?
 - A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. Where did that number come from, that 2,390,584?
- A. Yeah, it's interesting because I don't want to say that -- and again, it's sort of, you know, with respect to the work that I do. And, you know, as I indicated before, I bring the work that I do -- you know, it is what I do. It's my job.

There was no full accounting of the number of border patrol -- the number of releases under the Biden administration, so I had to survey documents that had been produced that were required to be produced by Judge Matthew Kaczmaryk in Texas versus Biden when the Supreme Court issued its decision of Biden versus Texas.

And then based upon custody and transfer statistics information that was provided by CBP with respect to border patrol, again, I didn't have it with respect to OFO, the Office of Field Operations.

And so all of my -- the information that I provided was based on open source reporting, but I

had to pull it from a number of different data points.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.5

- Q. Okay. Did you list those many data points here in your expert report, please?
- A. No, I did not. Probably if you -- to my testimony, I explained where the information came from.

Transparency has been a real problem with respect to this administration in getting solid numbers on releases. So I relied upon congressional testimony or congressional releases, open source evidence and things like that.

- Q. Okay. But whether the numbers are easy to get or not, you're telling me now that you have various sources that you used to put that number together, correct?
 - A. I did, Counsel.
- Q. And you don't list those sources here in your expert report, do you?
 - A. I do not.

MR. ST. JOHN: Asked and answered.

MR. SCHULTZ: Scott, you cut out there.

I'm going to let you please say your objection

again so it's clear for the record.

MR. ST. JOHN: Asked and answered.

1 MR. SCHULTZ: Thank you, Scott.

THE WITNESS: But that is where I got it

from.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

- Q. So you said various documents. Can you tell me now, please, what those documents are, even though they're not in the expert report?
- A. Sure. They are monthly disclosures in

 Texas versus Biden, from the disclosures by DHS, the

 CBP custody and transfer statistics. Those are the

 main sources that I was able to get them from.

More recently, the House Judiciary

Committee has released numbers with respect to

requests that they've made of Congress for that

information.

With respect to ICE, individuals who have been transferred from CBP to ICE and CBP OFO, those numbers are available. So the congressional numbers helped, but I didn't have those congressional numbers at the time that I drafted this.

- Q. And your expert report doesn't show how you put those numbers together to reach this number, does it?
 - A. It does not.
 - Q. Does your congressional testimony march

through the math that you used?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. No, but things that I've written in the past actually contain a running summary of that.
- Q. Okay. Do those things that you've written in the past go through all of your math number by number to show how you arrived at the conclusion?
 - A. Generally, yes.
- Q. Can you tell me which documents of yours in the past have that math, please?
- A. Sure. Things that I've written from the center with respect to tabulating the disclosures monthly as they've been created.

Again, I write a lot, so I can't tell you the specific documents, but I do go through to calculate them and I do provide the actual number.

Generally when I'm writing for the public,
I try to round it off or round it up. What I was
doing then, I actually provided the actual data
points.

- Q. When you say you were doing that, what does the "that" refer to, please?
- A. Monthly calculations to this and it's one of those things that a lot of congressional staff, a lot of people in the press ask me for with respect to that because I really -- until the House Judiciary

Committee compiled its report, I really was pretty much the basic source for that information, because I did the math.

- Q. Okay. If you can't remember with -- can you remember with any more detail right now what those publications are that you did for CAS that have your math?
- A. I really can't, but if you go to the website -- if you go to the disclosures in Texas versus Biden, you can actually compile the numbers as well.
 - Q. Okay.

2.2

2.3

- A. And there's more documents that were provided by DHS, CBP, and ICE.
- Q. Okay. I want to make sure you finished. Was there anything else? I think we stumbled over each other there for a second.
 - A. No, that's it.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. Thank you for letting us know so we can call up numbers ourselves, but what I am most interested in is the numbers that you put together. If you don't have that information in your head now, that is fine. We will send an e-mail to you, though, in writing, calling for you to please give us a list of those publications that you have

done so that we can see what you've done. So I just want to give you a heads up on that.

- A. Okay. Just to be clear, you want me to give you numbers that were actually provided by DHS?
- Q. We're going to ask you to simply refer us to what you just mentioned a minute ago. You said there's various numbers that you put together for CAS on a monthly basis, and you said that the publications that you give to CAS show your math. So that's what we're going to call for, the publications that you just mentioned that show your math.
 - A. Okay.

2.2

2.3

Q. Thank you. I need a moment here, please. Thank you.

So even if you can't recall those articles right now, can you please walk me through the methodology that you used, if you remember, please.

- A. Sure. I would go to the disclosures in

 Texas versus Biden and they would break it down into

 ICE and ICE releases from the border, CBP releases

 from the border, both border patrol and OFO.
- Q. What was that last acronym that you used, please?
- A. OFO. I apologize. I've referenced that before, Office of Field Operations.

Q. Thank you very much. Most of these acronyms I know. There's a few I don't. Even for the ones I do, it helps to repeat just to make sure we're all on the same page. Thank you.

So something else, I just want to make sure I have the right language here. Now, if you turn a little bit further down in paragraph 67, at the last sentence there, you say, "And the Biden administration is seeking to make the situation worse by cutting ICE funding."

Do you see that?

A. I do, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Did I read that last sentence correctly?
- A. You did, Counsel.
- Q. There's a footnote there, footnote 34, which then goes to a DHS website that you have at the bottom of the page there; is that right?
 - A. It is correct.
- Q. So let me ask you first of all, that footnote -- I'm going to work backwards a bit. Does that footnote, does the -- does the document that you cited in that footnote, does it say that the Biden administration is seeking to make the situation worse?
 - A. No, the reference to the footnote is by

cutting ICE funding.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Q. By cutting ICE funding. I see. Like I said, I'm going to back into this, so I appreciate your patience.

So let's just start with the start of the sentence: "Biden administration is seeking to make the situation worse" is what you wrote.

What do you mean by "situation," please?

- A. The situation with respect to the crisis at the southwest border with respect to the release of migrants into the United States.
- Q. Okay. And what do you mean by "worse," please?
- A. Exacerbated. The Biden administration has asked Congress to cut the amount of money that it has for DHS funding both in FY -- in its FY 2023 and FY 2024 budgets, from 34,000 down to 25,000.
 - Q. Okay. So --
- A. So it would actually limit the amount of detention space that it had.
- Q. I'm sorry, I thought I just heard a noise.

 Is everyone okay?
 - A. Yeah.

MR. ST. JOHN: Let's clarify the record. I think you're talking about funding for detention

1 beds; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MR. ST. JOHN: Okay.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Q. Okay. Thank you. And again, I heard a noise. Just want to make sure that no one is in trouble.

So you also mentioned -- we spoke about detention beds a little bit earlier. I'm not going to go back into that, but you also say "cutting ICE funding;" is that right, at the end of that sentence?

- A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. And you have the Biden administration cutting ICE funding, right?
- A. It's seeking to make that worse. I apologize, Counsel. I do have to clarify the record. It's seeking to make that worse by cutting ICE funding. Appropriations are set by Congress and they send a request to Congress for funding.
- Q. And that's kind of what I'm getting at here. It seems that what you're saying here is that the Biden administration is seeking to make things worse and the way that it's seeking to make things worse is by itself cutting ICE funding; is that accurate or not accurate, what I just said, as to

what your thoughts are?

2.2

2.3

- A. Regrettably this is one of the imprecisions of the English language. The "seeking" actually modifies "to make the situation worse." "By cutting ICE funding" would be through the appropriations process.
- Q. So does the Biden administration, meaning the executive branch, do they have the power unilaterally to cut ICE funding in the United States government system?
- A. They do have the ability not to utilize ICE detention space. With respect to ICE funding, it's interesting because it's 8 USC 1368 requires DHS, on a semi-annual basis, to send a report to Congress that talks about the amount of funding that it will need to inform that congressional answer -- that estimate.

To the best of my knowledge, they haven't sent that report. What they do send is the budget for DHS to Congress.

- Q. And I think we both know the answer, but just to be clear, it's Congress that sets the budget, correct?
- A. At the request of the president, and of course they have their own deliberations.

2.2

2.3

Page 132

In the absence of other information, again, the report that's required under 1368, they're relying upon what the administration says is the appropriate amount. But of course, they do have their own appropriations system with discussion and debate.

In fact, I think in the 2023 budget, notwithstanding the fact that the Biden administration asked for a cut, they let detention bed space static.

- Q. Does Congress always follow what the executive wants in budgets from year to year?
- A. No. Congress has authority -- is informed by the president, but they have their own independent authority to do that.
- Q. This is going back outside the scope of your report: Didn't the founding fathers say that Congress has the power of the purse; isn't that a phrase you've heard?
- A. It's a phrase I've heard. It's a phrase I've used, correct.
 - Q. Is that correct?
- A. Congress does have the power of the purse, but they rely upon the executive branch with respect to the amount of funding that they need.

- Q. When you say "rely on," what do you mean by that, please?
- A. So if the administration says that it doesn't need more detention beds, that it can handle the situation perfectly fine without it, that is definitely something that is going to inform Congress' discussions.
- Q. Okay. Does Congress sometime put things in the budget that the executive doesn't want?
 - A. They do.
 - Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

- A. As happened in the FY 2023 budget.
- Q. Has happened in the FY 2023 budget; is that what you just said?
 - A. Yeah, with respect to detention beds, as I alluded to before.
 - Q. Thank you. Again, just wanted to make sure that I heard the -- I would say words, but heard the letters and numbers correctly. So thank you.
 - A. Thank you. By FY, I mean fiscal year.
 - Q. One moment, please. Thank you.
 - I'm sorry, I sometimes am pressing the button here too many times.
- 24 A. I saw what happened.
- Q. Thank you.

A. Thank you, Mr. Schultz.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Just to follow up on what you were saying about the detention beds, weren't there COVID restrictions on that?
- A. There were COVID restrictions on the detention beds. There were lawsuits that placed COVID restrictions on detention.
- Q. And can you tell me a bit more about that, please?
- A. I can't remember the cases in particular.

 I know the one had to do with Adelanto, which is a detention facility in California. And in fact, ICE just announced they're shutting down Adelanto, notwithstanding the fact the Biden administration has the ability to go back and ask those restrictions to be lifted. In the case of Adelanto, it doesn't appear they did.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Madam Transcriber, A-d-e-l-a-n-t-o.
 - Q. Capital A usually, right?
 - A. Capital A, yes.
- Q. Thank you. So still staying with paragraph 67, the first part of that sentence, at least what I view as the first part of that sentence, to read it, "And the Biden administration is seeking to make the

situation worse."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Just referring to that part of the sentence, please, you don't have any citation for that, do you, in your expert report?

- A. It's the cutting ICE funding. It is a natural circumstance that flows with respect to daily detention beds. There have been tensions not only within this administration, with respect to prior ones, with respect to utilization of detention beds.
- Q. I think we've already covered that ground then. Okay.

Let's skip ahead a little bit to paragraph 93, which I know is a little bit of a jump forward.

I like to make sure I have this right here.

- A. You got it. 93 has to do with the latest asylum IFRS.
- Q. I just want to make sure that my notes are matching up to what I have here.

There we go. So you talked about -- in the second sentence it talks about information between June and September 2022; is that right?

- A. That's correct, Counsel. June of 2023.
- Q. What I have is between June and September 2022, column, asylum officers conducted 572 AMIs. That's the second sentence of paragraph 93.

- A. I apologize. I was looking at 94.
- Q. That's okay.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

- A. Yeah, I'm looking at it.
- Q. Okay. So I'm not so much focussing on the year, which is 2022, but it says months June and September. Do you see those there?
 - A. I do, Counsel.
 - Q. And are you looking at paragraph 93?
 - A. I am, Counsel.
- Q. Thank you. And that's four months, right, inclusive?
 - A. That is correct, Counsel.
 - Q. Okay. So going back a little bit to push and pull factors, let me ask a foundation question here.

Are you saying that the data that you -that you discuss there is something that contributed
to the pull under the IFR that led migrant flows to
increase in the United States?

MR. ST. JOHN: Objection.

THE WITNESS: That actually doesn't reference that in that paragraph, sir.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

Q. Okay. Is that what you were getting at or did I kind of misunderstand what you were trying to

get at there?

2.2

2.3

- A. No, I was explaining the implementation of the IFR there.
- Q. So you are speaking about the implementation of the IFR then?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Is it your opinion -- and I'm not saying that you have this here, I'm just saying is it your opinion now speaking to me, that four months of data would be enough to influence the pull strength that might lead more people to migrate to the United States?
- A. The issue with respect to this particular IFR is the expansion of it. At the time that the administration actually issued the IFR, they announced that it was going to be implemented gradually as it went forward.

So the bigger implementation is with respect to the increase in asylum grants based on the IFR vis- -vis the asylum grants by immigration judges. It would increase the amount.

So I believe there were 325,000 asylum claims filed with the DOJ in FY 2023. Again, the majority of these asylum claims go to the immigration court. DOJ also keeps statistics on cases arising

from a credible fear claim.

2.2

2.3

So with respect to that, there is a significant differential. It's actually 11.63 percent.

The more cases that were transferred over to AOs under the IFR, the more grants there are going to be, the larger it would grow. It's a very small population at this juncture.

- Q. So the fact that it's a small population in your opinion, does that make the pull factor of the IFR less strong?
- A. The gradual implementation of it does except for the fact that DHS continues to release individuals to go to immigration court with NTAs to apply for asylum or not.
- Q. Okay. So I suppose what I'm getting at here -- this is funny, you might remember a little bit ago I asked you to walk me through how the communication would work for a pull factor. Then you gave me an answer.

Do you remember that you answered that question?

- A. Yeah, I do.
- Q. So I'm going to ask a similar question here. So you just told me that it's a small sample

and that it's an implemented -- incremental rollout of how this is being applied; is that fair?

- A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. So you don't have a crystal ball and the migrants don't have a crystal ball, correct?
 - A. Correct, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Q. So walk me through, please, how this is going to be a pull factor then that has any strength.

Are you saying that people will hear that there is a new program that is now being executed and that the new program is quite small, though who knows if it gets bigger or not, given the lack of a crystal ball; and given that, are you saying that that's enough force to make a pull factor to get people to migrate to the U.S.?

MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Vague and misleading.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

- Q. I'm just asking if that's what he said. He can answer any way he wants.
- A. With respect to what I said, when this comes up to scale, which you know is the anticipation of this rule, the number of individuals who are released under the parol provision for individuals facing credible fear and the number of people who are

1 granted asylum will create a very significant pull 2 factor for individuals to come to the United States. 3 0. Is the pull factor significant now? It was gradually implemented, so the answer 4 5 to that is it's de minimis. So let's look at logistics a little bit. 6 Ο. 7 It's 1:18 p.m. We've been going a little bit over 8 three hours. Just about three hours once you take 9 the breaks into account. And it's lunchtime, at least here in the east coast. 10 11 MR. SCHULTZ: Scott, apologies, Louisiana 12 is one hour off, correct? One hour difference. 13 Sorry, I'm using east coast norm there, which I should not do. 14 15 Louisiana is one hour earlier compared to 16 the east coast where North Carolina and D.C. 17 are, right? 18 MR. ST. JOHN: This is a fine time for a 19 lunch break, yeah. 20 MR. SCHULTZ: That's where I'm going. 21 THE WITNESS: I'm perfectly happy to keep 2.2 going. 23 MR. SCHULTZ: I understand that. We have folks here who I know need to eat. And if I 24 25 don't get food into my system before too long, I

Page 141 1 might start to feel it also. 2 (RECESS TAKEN.) BY MR. SCHULTZ: 3 So let's turn to page 17 of your report, 4 Ο. 5 please, Judge. Yes, Counsel. 6 Α. I couldn't hear you. I'm so sorry. 7 Q. 8 Α. Yes, Counsel. 9 Thank you. Two-thirds of the way down, Ο. three-fourths of the way down it says the asylum IFR. 10 11 Do you see that there? 12 Α. Page 17? 13 That's right, sir. It's just a subheading. Ο. Yes, I do see it. Yes. 14 Α. 15 Ο. Okay. So we've been using the term IFR, 16 and I just wanted to -- I think we all know what it 17 means, but let's just make sure. 18 Can you tell me what that acronym stands 19 for, please? 20 Α. It's the Interim Final Rule on the asylum 21 officer rule that creates the IMA system process and it was published on March 29th, 2022. 22 2.3 Ο. And just so we're all on the same page, 24 again, Scott, I understand the record will speak for 25 itself. Just so we're all on the same page, if you

- know it, do you know the official citation to that?
- A. I could look it up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. That's okay. But you gave us a date, so that's how we're going to make sure we're all on the same page about what it's referring to. I wanted to pin that one down.
 - A. Very good.

MR. SCHULTZ: Scott, did you have something to say there?

MR. ST. JOHN: No.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

Q. Okay. So I have a few questions, not surprisingly, about the IFR then.

First of all, can you tell me your understanding, please, of what it says?

- A. The IFR sets up a process for aliens who have received positive credible fear determinations under section 235(b)(1) of the INA, to have their applications maintained and adjudicated by asylum officers, not immigration judges in the course of removal proceedings.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. If you look at paragraph 69, I'm going to read the first part of it, but we can talk about more if you need to.

It says "EOIR and the USCIS explained that

- as a number of asylum claims at the southwest border has skyrocketed over the years." And the sentence goes on. Do you see that?
 - A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. And that's basically -- paragraph 69, bottom of the page 17 over to page 18, right?
 - A. Correct, Counsel.
- Q. Do you agree with what I just read from that paragraph? I mean, you wrote it.
- 10 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Vague.
- 11 THE WITNESS: That's a correct citation to the asylum rule.

13 BY MR. SCHULTZ:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. Do you agree that the number of asylum claims at the southwest border has skyrocketed over the years?
 - A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. How many years?
- A. Well, it really began to jump toward the end of 2019 and has increased throughout then to 2023.
- Q. Okay. So thank you. Just moving a couple of paragraphs later, paragraph 71, page 18. That's basically a couple -- a line and a half from you plus a pull quote, plus two pull quotes.

Do you see that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

- A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. And on the second pull quote, this is -- I'm sorry, let me back up. The pull quote, both of them are from 46908, 46909, right? That's what you have there at line 26?
- A. Yes, that is correct. And I can't remember whether that was from the JNPRM or the IFR. That's the Joint Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.
- Q. That was my next question. Thank you so much.

And the second pull quote there says, quote, "The ability to stay in the United States for years waiting for an initial decision may motivate unauthorized border crossings by individuals who otherwise might not have sought to enter the United States and who lack a meritorious protection claim."

Is that the start of the second pull quote there in paragraph 71?

- A. It is, Counsel.
- Q. And do you agree with what that sentence says?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And then you say then that the delay is a pull factor?

A. The delay facilitates people living and working in the United States so that it creates a pull factor.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

2.2

2.3

How does it facilitate? How does that delay facilitate people living and working in the U.S.? Can you just walk me through your chain of thought there, please?

- A. Sure. In a couple of different ways.

 First, the delay allows people to live and work into the United States -- I'm sorry, live in and work in the United States, which it allows them to make money here, live their lives here, send their kids to school here, and to make money in this country and build up equities.
- Q. And the thing about the delay allows all of that to happen, right?
 - A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Let's turn over to paragraph 74 then, please. I'm just going to find my spot here for a moment. Thanks for your patience.
 - A. Page 19?
- Q. Page 19, yes. That is paragraph 74 at the bottom there, and it starts off where you wrote "EOIR and USCIS acknowledge that the proposed rule would

alter eligibility for" --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. It reads "one benefit."
- Q. Right. I'm sorry, I'm reading the wrong part of that paragraph. I apologize.

Let's skip to the next page, same paragraph, middle -- the second sentence there. It's right after it says table two, top of page 20.

First full sentence starts, "EOIR and USCIS nevertheless took the facially implausible position that there would be no impact on state governments," end quote, though the sentence does continue.

Do you see where I wrote that?

- A. Yes, Counsel.
- Q. I'm sorry, do you see where you wrote that?

 I'm sorry.
 - A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. Thank you. Why is that facially implausible?
- A. Because by releasing individuals into the United States more quickly it's going to make them eligible for public benefits such as Medicare, SNAP, TANF, and will allow them to then immigrate more immediate relatives to the United States that would again further draw down those means-tested public benefits, and also, if they brought children to the

United States would impose a cost on the schools.

- Q. Now, that sentence in the middle does have a citation that says see id. at 46,925, table two. Do you see that?
 - A. I do, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Does that citation say that it's facially implausible?
- A. I'd have to take a look at the citation, Counsel.
- Q. Do you think you'd remember if there were a federal document that calls it facially implausible in your field?
- A. I probably would. I have a feeling that it doesn't have the facially implausible part on it.
- Q. Okay. So with the facially implausible part, do you have any evidence that it's facially implausible?
- A. Well, I have evidence that it's facially implausible for the reasons that I stated before.

Individuals who are illegally present in the United States are eligible for Medicare except for emergency Medicare. They're not eligible for SNAP or TANF. There's also an increase in incarceration cost that is possible as more people come into the United States. And again, the

education cost that I referenced before.

One other thing that is facially implausible is that the rule itself talks about the effect it's going to have on the wages and working conditions of Americans. And again, you know, we talked about the benefits to businesses, but it didn't talk about the detriments to workers, who would then have to use those means-tested public benefits.

- Q. So at page 20, paragraph 78 --
- A. Yes, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Q. -- you talk about -- you talk about -- I'll use the word myself, but you don't use this word, but a delay of 21 days after the noncitizen has been served a record for positive credible fear determination.

Do you see that in 78? That's quoting the federal regulation.

- A. I do see that, Counsel.
- Q. And you didn't use the word "pause" or "delay" there though, right?
 - A. I did not, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. But that's -- is it fair to say that that's what this calls for, that at a certain point there's a 21-day period where the case cannot go

forward for 21 days; is that right?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. It specifically calls for that and that was a provision that was added between the Joint Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and the Interim Final Rule.
- Q. Okay. So I'm going to ask you a few questions about this. Let's take a few steps back, first of all.

Under federal asylum, you're familiar with federal asylum law from your experience in immigration law, right?

- A. Yes, sir, I am.
- Q. Under federal asylum law, how long does someone have to file for asylum after they set foot in this country, absent some special circumstances?
 - A. One year.
- Q. One year. Okay. And I'll ask a straightforward question: What's longer, one year or 21 days?
 - A. One year is longer than 21 days, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Now, in immigration court, there's actually several steps that go into someone's asylum application and consideration, right?
 - A. There are, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. So the first is or one of the important ones that you just said, someone has to

- file an asylum application within a year of their getting here, correct?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. Let's assume for the moment for this question that the case ends up in asylum court. Can immigration judges give extensions?
 - A. They can.
 - Q. Okay. And you were an immigration judge you said, right?
 - A. I was in a detained court. So efficiency was key in those cases, but I would grant brief continuances.
 - Q. When you say brief, how long would that be?
 - A. Generally one week, ten days.
- O. One week?
- 16 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

- Q. Seven to ten days?
 - A. Seven to ten days. It could be longer.
 - Q. Okay. So seven days is a third of that 21 days there, right?
 - A. It is, correct, Counsel.
- Q. Ten days is just under half of that 21 days, right?
- 24 A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. But you undoubtedly -- maybe you didn't.

Were you -- did you ever have communications with immigration judges who -- actually, you know what? Let me ask you this: I remember reading one of your columns, I can't remember which one, but I can find it if I have to, when you said how long it took you to decide an immigration case in your detained court.

Do you remember writing that in one of your columns or posts?

A. I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Do you remember the number you gave there?
- A. I believe it was 45 days.
- Q. And to ask again an obvious question, what's longer, 45 days or 21 days?
 - A. 45 days is longer than 21 days.
- Q. Thank you. Now, when you were an immigration judge in your detained court, did you ever talk to judges who either were on other sorts of courts or who knew about processes in other sorts of courts?
 - A. I did.
- Q. And I'm being a bit vague here. I shouldn't be. When I say other sorts of courts, what I mean is nondetained court. Have you heard the phrase, nondetained court or nondetained docket?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Page 152

- Q. Can you tell me what that means, please?
- A. A nondetained docket is one in which the alien is not in NHS custody while the case is proceeding.
- Q. And in your experience or your knowledge, do cases of nondetained dockets take longer to resolve than cases on detained dockets?
- A. Unless, of course, they fail to appear at the initial master calendar, at which case there was an order for removal issued.
- Q. I think I might have missed your last word there or so.
- A. I apologize. You dipped out for a second there.
- Q. That's okay. Let's take a minute and maybe let the technology catch its breath and then you can repeat it.
- A. Were you asking me about something that I said?
- Q. I missed the last couple words of your last answer, yeah.
- A. I apologize. Unless they failed to appear, in which case they would be ordered removed in absentia.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you. And you probably don't

get in absentias very much in the detained docket anyway because folks are right there in detention, right?

- A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. But aside from the in absentias, do cases generally take longer in nondetained dockets than detained dockets?
 - A. They do, Counsel.
- Q. Is it fair to say that it takes sometimes years to decide?
 - A. It can.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- O. On a nondetained docket?
- A. It could take years for those to be adjudicated.
- Q. And even if it can take years, under -tell me, is it -- tell me if you know this or not, if
 this is something you're familiar with: Have you
 heard about what the goal is for the executive office
 of immigration review and what their timeline is to
 resolve cases in on the nondetained docket? Have you
 ever heard of a goal for them to do that within a
 specific time?
- A. The statutory goal is 180 days. Again, I was in a detained court, so anything that had to do with nondetained court is nothing I would have been

told about.

2.3

- Q. Is 180 days more than 21 days?
- A. 180 days is more than 21 days, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. And is one way that the detained docket cases can take longer than 180 days or even longer than a year, is that because immigration judges on nondetained dockets sometimes give extensions that can last for a prolonged period of time?
- A. If they're administratively closed, the average period of time that a case was administratively closed was longer. They can give extensions for longer periods of time based on the docket.
- Q. Okay. So given the various time periods that we just spoke about, which are longer than 21 days, is there -- let me actually -- let me focus your attention here just to make it easier. I think it's paragraph 92.

In paragraph 92 you talk about how the 21-day delay -- that's where you use the word delay, paragraph 92 -- can lead to coaching and fraud. Do you remember writing that?

- A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. So for these other periods of time that we

just talked about in immigration court that are longer than 21 days, do those present similar opportunities for fraud and delay or is there a difference?

2.2

2.3

A. Well, there's a difference because under the Interim Final Rule, the IFR, the Credible Fear Interview is the asylum application. So for that reason, there is no delay for them to file the asylum application.

This is a delay that they don't give any reason for except for to consult with counsel and to supplement the record, to clean up things that they had said that -- and again, I'm not speaking generally. Fraud is a thing in immigration court.

And we know that unscrupulous practitioners have in fact coached and drafted applications for aliens in immigration court.

So it is an issue for them with respect to the -- now I've lost my train of thought. Can you ask the question again?

- Q. I think you've answered it. I was happy to hear your additional thoughts, though.
- A. I want to make sure that I've answered it in full.
- MR. SCHULTZ: I'll ask the court reporter

to read back the question, please.

(Court reporter read back the question:

"So for these other periods of time that we just talked about in immigration court that are longer than 21 days, do those present similar opportunities for fraud and delay or is there a difference?")

THE WITNESS: They offer similar opportunities for fraud and delay except for the fact that as soon as the asylum application is filed in immigration court, again, you have a limited opportunity to consult with counsel and to amend your application, but there will be questions that are raised about those amendments.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

2.2

2.3

- Q. Okay. When you were an immigration judge and someone had an asylum case in front of you, when the hearing started, the individual merits hearing started, did you ever ask the lawyer or the respondent if they wanted to or needed to amend or supplement their asylum application?
- A. Yes. Actually, I would ask them, if it was their asylum application, if they wanted to amend or to change it in any way, or for ICE counsel to ask

questions about the amendments in question.

- Q. Okay. Did you do that routinely?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Did that open the door for fraud and coaching when you did that?
- A. It presented -- it did open the door for fraud and coaching, but it also presented a situation where people realized -- where government counsel understood that there had been a change in the record and could ask about that particular change.
- Q. Okay. Let's take a moment here and put things on mute. Thanks.

Thanks. We were trying to get some of our documents in line so it's less improvised as we're trying to show you the next documents.

I apologize again. I just noticed I have another mistake in my exhibit numbers. I just need another moment. Thank you.

I think I have my ducks in a row now.

Apologize for that delay. Let's turn over to

paragraph 88, please. I think that's on page 23.

- A. Yes, Counsel.
- Q. So I'm basing these new questions, addressing what you have there, when you talk about the USCIS director, Ur Jaddou. And you talked about

her in that paragraph, correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- A. It's actually Ur Jaddou. Madam Transcriber, J-a-d-d-o-u.
- Q. Thank you. Ur Jaddou. My apologies to you and the director if I mispronounced that.

So here you -- to summarize, please tell me if my summary is fair or not. Is it fair to say that you criticize her for distinguishing between services and enforcement within USCIS? Is that fair or would you say it differently?

MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. The document speaks for itself.

13 THE WITNESS: Yeah, that is fair.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

- Q. Thank you. Again, I apologize if this comes out as an obvious question. Do you know what USCIS stands for?
 - A. I do, Counsel.
 - Q. Can you tell me, please?
- A. It's United States Citizenship and Immigration Services.
 - Q. Is the word "enforcement" in the title?
- A. It is not.
- Q. Okay. Does that change your view of what you wrote in that paragraph?

2.2

2.3

Page 159

A. Actually, no, because USCIS is actually part of DHS, which is an agency that was created to protect the Homeland Security. The entire agency has, to some degree, a law enforcement component.

There is actually also a branch within

USCIS called the Fraud Detection and National

Security Branch that is -- that was created

specifically to protect the national security and to prevent fraud.

- Q. Thank you. Aside from what you just told me, do you have any evidence that you can point to for why enforcement should be the mission over services?
- A. Again, I participated in the drafting of the Homeland Security Act. The entire idea behind the Homeland Security Act was actually protecting the homeland from all, you know, possible harms that it may suffer, and that includes harms related to fraud, the possibility that individuals who posed a national security risk to the United States would be able to exploit the system in order to come here.

There is a law enforcement component to USCIS. And in fact, I believe section 235(b)(1) of the INA states that the asylum officer is supposed to order the alien removed if there is no finding of

welfare, which is a law enforcement activity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. Thank you. Your words cut out for the last five seconds or so, if you could just repeat that last sentence, please.
- A. I'm sorry. I don't know if that was on my end. I hope it wasn't.

Section 235(b)(1) of the INA directs the asylum officer to order the alien removed if there is no finding of credible fear, and that is a law enforcement activity.

- Q. Thank you. Did Inspector Jaddou say that she was going to stop enforcing section 235(b)(1)?
- A. It's actually Director Jaddou. Did she say that she was going to stop? What was the question again? I apologize.
- Q. That's okay. Did she say that she was going to stop enforcing section 235(b)(1)?
- A. She did not state that, but I conclude that the way this rule is written, it would definitely change section 235(b)(1) as Congress has written.
- Q. So staying in that same paragraph, you wrote that the director, quote, "Has a reputation of hostility to border enforcement."

Do you see that?

A. I do, Counsel. And the next two lines

actually are the bases of support for that statement.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Okay. When you say the next two lines, do you mean --
 - A. I'm sorry, the next sentence after that.
- Q. Okay. So let me read this in the record.

 The record -- the sentence that I read says, "Jaddou has a reputation of hostility to border enforcement."

The following sentence says, "She spent time as the director of DHS Watch, a pro-amnesty nonprofit."

Is that the sentence you're referring to?

- A. I'll correct what I said the first time. It's the next two sentences.
- Q. Okay. And the following sentence is,

 "During that time she went so far as to call for

 Congress to pause CBP funding and referred to CBP as

 the 'personal malitia' to then-president Donald

 Trump."
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. That is the sentence you're referring to?
 - A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. So do those sentences show that she has a reputation of hostility or that you view her as being hostile in that way?
 - A. It would create a reputation of hostility

to law enforcement or to enforcement on its face.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

2.5

- Q. On its face. And what do you mean by "on its face," please?
- A. The statement that customs and border protection is a personal malitia in carrying out its law enforcement functions and asking to pause funding. That evidences hostility to border enforcement on its face.
- Q. Okay. Are there other parts of the government involved in border enforcement besides CBP?
 - A. With respect to border enforcement --
 - Q. I misspoke. I'm so sorry. Thank you.

Are there other parts of the federal government involved in immigration enforcement besides CBP?

- A. Yes. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you.
- A. Their jurisdiction is over activities in the interior and detention pending removal proceedings and removal.
- Q. You don't have anything in paragraph 88 indicating that Director Jaddou has ever criticized that part of the government, have you?

- A. I do not, counsel. The reference is to border enforcement in my prior sentence.
- Q. Okay. Let's turn a little bit to -- let's turn to paragraph 89 now and I'd like to talk a little bit about credible fear interviews, please.

So please let me know when you flip there, but the questions are going to start off more generally, and not so much about the actual text of the paragraph.

A. I'm ready to go.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. So just to be clear, when you say AO, do you mean asylum officer?
 - A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. And at various points either you or I might say CFI, does that mean Credible Fear Interview?
- A. Yes. It's not a term that I generally use. I generally just refer to credible fear, but if you use it as that, I will understand it.
- Q. Thank you. I will try to use the full words.
 - A. You don't have to. I'll understand it now.
- Q. It's probably easier for everyone to have fewer acronyms, but thank you for indulging if I do slip.
 - So what is -- in your own words, please,

what is an asylum officer Credible Fear Interview?

2.2

2.3

- A. A Credible Fear Interview is a screening process that an asylum officer uses in order to determine whether there's a substantial likelihood that an alien who was subject to expedited removal would be eligible for asylum.
- Q. Okay. And does the Credible Fear Interview performed by asylum officers only look to asylum or does it look to any other sort of protection?
- A. By statute it does not look to any other form of protection except for withholding of removal, but I believe that the actual title is credible fear -- yeah, it would also look to statutory withholding under section 241(b)(3) of the INA. By regulation, protection under Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture has been added to that definition.
- Q. When you're talking about statutory withholding, withholding of removal, what does that mean, please?
- A. It's withholding of removal under section 243(b)(1) of the INA. It is a former protection for individuals usually who aren't eligible for asylum, to prevent them from being removed from the United States.

So an order of removal is issued and then withholding is -- removal is withheld from a specific country. So withholding or removal is country-specific.

Q. Okay.

2.2

2.3

- A. As you know from having been a judge, you order someone removed to a country or countries.
- Q. Thank you. And you also mentioned the Convention Against Torture. Can you please tell me what you mean by that?
- A. The Convention Against Torture is an international agreement that the United States has signed onto to prevent the United States from returning countries -- aliens to countries where they'd be subject to torture by or at the instigation or acquiesces of a government official or other person acting in official capacity.

Torture has been defined by case law and by statute -- by regulation, not statute. There is no statutory provision except for the, FARRA, F-A-R-A, with respect to the Convention Against Torture or CAT as it's called.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. And CAT stands for Convention Against Torture; is that right?
 - A. That is correct, yes.

- Q. Thanks. And just to make sure that we're rounding out the corners here, we've been speaking of asylum. Can you just tell me your understanding of the definition of asylum itself, please?
- A. Asylum is a form of relief that is granted to an alien who establishes either persecution or well-founded fear of persecution based on race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion.
- Q. Thank you. Turning back to the text of paragraph 89, you write, "AO credible fear interviews have historically been non-adversarial, in sharp contrast to the adversarial truth-finding in subsequent proceedings before an IJ."

Do you see that?

A. I do, Counsel.

2.2

2.3

- Q. Okay. So what do you mean by non-adversarial?
- A. Non-adversarial means that there is no -the process that we're going through right now,

 Counsel, is an adversarial proceeding. You are
 asking me questions on the record to probe the
 statements I've made and to impeach statements that

 I've made in the past. That's an adversarial
 proceeding. Courts are adversarial proceedings.

A non-adversarial asylum interview means that there is no government attorney, in this case from ICE, present at that to offer contrary evidence, to offer contrary evidence, to cross-examine the alien and to impeach the alien.

- Q. Okay. Thank you.
 - And is a CFI non-adversarial?
- A. It is, Counsel.
- Q. Thank you. At a CFI interview, at a Credible Fear Interview, that is, can the asylum officer ask questions?
 - A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. Can credible fear interviews get confrontational or tense?
- A. It's never been my experience that that happens. Sometimes if there's internal inconsistencies, asylum officers will ask about them and I've reviewed a lot of transcripts from asylum officer, CFIs, as you refer to them.
- Q. Okay. Now, we spoke a moment about what asylum means and what withholding -- statutory withholding of removal means and what the Convention Against Torture means.

Does the Credible Fear Interview apply the same standard as any of those three types of relief

for protection?

2.2

2.3

- A. It actually applies a lower standard with respect to statutory of withholding under section 241(b)(3) of the INA with respect to the Convention Against Torture.
- Q. Does it apply the same standard as is necessary for a final determination on asylum?
- A. It does not. That's why Congress included the "substantial likelihood" language.
- Q. Now, is the credible -- is the standard for credible fear interviews -- let me back up again.

 There's one other acronym that comes up, AMI, that's in your report, I believe. Can you tell me what AMI means, please?
- A. Asylum Merits Interview under the Interim Final Rule.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. And does an AMI have the same standard -- I'm sorry, I apologize. I'll skip the acronyms.

Does an Asylum Merits Interview use the same standard as a Credible Fear Interview?

A. It is supposed to use the statutory standard with respect to asylum statutory withholding under section 241(b)(3) as well as the regulatory standard for a torture convention claim.

- Q. Thank you. I'm not sure I completely understood that. Let me --
- A. I apologize. I can clarify. But go ahead and ask me. I'll explain.
- Q. Let me break it down. So at a CFI -- I'm sorry, at a Credible Fear Interview, the ultimate standard for asylum relief is not applied, correct?
 - A. It is not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Okay. Is the ultimate standard for asylum relief applied at an Asylum Merits Interview?
- A. It is supposed to be by statute and regulation.
- Q. So does the statute and regulations state that the final asylum standard will be applied for Asylum Merits Interviews?
 - A. It does state that.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. So is it fair to say that the standard that's applied in the Credible Fear Interview is different from the standard that's applied at the Asylum Merits Interview?
 - A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. So let's turn back in time a little bit to before the IFR, before the Interim Final Regulation was put into effect. Okay? So we're talking --

A. It's actually Interim Final Rule.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Q. I apologize. Interim Final Rule. Thank you. Let's turn back to time before that.

So before the IFR was ever implemented or even written, did asylum officers ever -- did asylum officers ever grant asylum in any context?

- A. They did, through the affirmative asylum process.
- Q. Okay. And what do you mean by the affirmative asylum process?
- A. The affirmative asylum process is an asylum application filed in an asylum office by an alien, not citizen -- I apologize, I used a statutory term. Please forgive me -- who is present in the United States but is not in removal proceeding. That's called affirmative asylum.
 - Q. Is there another sort of asylum?
 - A. Defensive asylum.
- Q. Okay. And when you say asylum, do you mean defensive asylum application; is that fair?
- A. That is correct. It's a -- prior to the IFR, it was all on the I589, which is captioned Application For Asylum and Withholding of Removal.
- Q. And is the actual asylum standard different in defensive asylum applications versus affirmative

asylum applications?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. It's the same statutory standard that's set forth in section 208 of the INA.
- Q. Okay. And would that also be true for what we call statutory withholding of removal and convention -- I'm sorry, let me start over.

When asylum officers in the past have considered positive applications for asylum, could they also consider positive applications for statutory withholding?

- A. No, they do not.
- Q. Okay. What about the Convention Against Torture?
- A. They do not. A condition precedent to granting either statutory withholding under section 241(b)(3) or withholding under the Convention Against Torture or deferral under the Convention Against Torture require a final order of removal. And for that reason, they don't have jurisdiction to adjudicate them.
- Q. So when we're talking about positive application for asylum, we're talking just asylum?
- A. We're talking about just asylum. That's correct.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you. Given that, is the

asylum standard that asylum officers apply -- I'm sorry. Let me start over.

Is the asylum standard for positive asylum applications the same as those for defensive asylum applications?

- A. The asylum standard is the same except by statute.
- Q. Thank you. And how many years, if you know, have asylum officers in CIS been making the final decisions on asylum in positive asylum applications?
 - A. In USCIS?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Let's limit it to that, yes.
- A. Since March 1st, 2003.
- Q. Thank you. Is that when the Department of Homeland Security was created?
 - A. That's correct, Counsel.
 - Q. About 20 years then, right?
 - A. About 20 years, yes, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Is there any reason to believe that asylum officers over 20 years or so have been making asylum determinations in affirmative asylum applications would have any reason to act in a different way when they're reviewing defensive asylum applications?

A. I know that the standards for review affirmative asylum applications are not as robust as they are with the BIA system, Board of Immigration Appeals system, on review of immigration judge decision.

Asylum officer decision are not publicly available documents. So I don't have any reason to believe that they are, but based upon the review standards, there's a distinct possibility that they're not.

Q. And thank you for answering that. I had a little bit of trouble following that because of the pronouns. Let me try to break that down a little bit more then.

Let's put aside immigration judges. Okay? If possible.

A. Okay.

2.2

2.3

Q. But my question is not on immigration judges, so my question is just on asylum judges. If you need to bring it in, by all means, please do.

But what I'm trying to get at here is, if asylum officers have been making decisions on asylum for 20 years in the context of affirmative applications, what is to make you doubt they'll do any worse a job on defensive applications?

A. There is no visibility in the system and all of the review that takes place with respect to those asylum officer decisions, it's entirely internal.

2.2

2.3

You're not going to find a circuit court case that discusses that affirmative asylum application process because there is no judicial review of a grant.

- Q. So maybe I should ask a different question.
- Do you have any criticisms of the system that allows asylum officers to make determinations about asylum for affirmative applications of asylum?
- A. I do have concerns about the validity of that system, generally.
- Q. I think we stumbled on your last two words. Repeat those last two or three words, please.
 - A. Generally was the last one.
- Q. Thank you. Are the concerns that you have the same for asylum officers making decisions in the positive or affirmative application context versus the defensive context?
- A. The defensive context is a proceeding in which it's an adversarial proceeding, as we stated before. And there is an opportunity for cross-examination and an opportunity for ICE to

review those or to appeal those decisions.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

2.5

There is no opportunity for that -- those procedural safeguards aren't present in the affirmative asylum process.

- Q. Okay. So when you talked about the adversarial, though, that's in the immigration court context, right?
 - A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. And the positive -- the positive -- sorry, the decisions that asylum officers make to positive applications or affirmative applications for asylum, those are non-adversarial, correct?
- A. The affirmative asylum process is not adversarial.
- Q. Just like the process under the IFR is non-adversarial, correct?
 - A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. So in that sense, they're parallel, correct?
- A. The process under the IFR is parallel to the affirmative asylum process. It is not adversarial. In fact, it specifically calls it a non-adversarial interview in the IFR.
- Q. Do you fear that there will be worse results under the IF R before asylum officers versus

positive applications for asylum before asylum officers?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. By positive, do you mean affirmative asylum applications?
 - Q. I do. Thank you for that clarification.
- A. Yeah, I think that it will probably be similar. I'm concerned that the applications as adjudicated by the -- under the IFR is going to be worse because many of the individuals who have -- who apply for affirmative asylum have actually been lawfully admitted to the United States.

They've been screened by a counselor or officer before they enter the United States or they came under the Visa Waiver Program. Counselor screening is one of those things that happens abroad.

For those individuals who enter illegally and apply for the affirmative asylum process, they actually have a footprint in the United States, something that we can look to to determine whether bars to asylum, as we've referred to them, may be present in a specific case.

We're not going to have that same level of trust in this process because, by definition, these individuals haven't been in the United States before or have only very briefly been in the United States.

Q. Let's talk about that counselor screening process for a minute.

2.2

2.3

When someone tries to come to the United States through a counselor screening process of getting a visa; is that what you're referring to?

- A. I am, by the Department of State abroad.
- Q. Does that screening take place for people who are coming on, for instance, tourist visas?
- A. If they're not from a visa waiver country, it does include people who are coming here on tourist visas. People who are coming here from a visa waiver country perform an online application before they can come here.
- Q. For the people who are not on the Visa
 Waiver Program, when they go to the state department
 consulate abroad, are they screened for asylum
 criteria?
- A. They're not screened for asylum criteria.

 Section 212(a) of the INA contains a number of grounds of inadmissibility for aliens who are seeking to enter the United States. Amongst those grounds for inadmissibility are a national security risk and to determine whether they have a criminal history.

Because they are seeking a visa to come to the United States, the counselor or officer abroad

can check with the security system in that country and can require the applicant to provide a police report before adjudicating that.

2.2

2.3

Because the IFR considers the Credible Fear Interview to be the asylum application under section 208.6, we can't make those counselor checks abroad based upon information that the applicant is included in the asylum application.

- Q. Let's talk about what you said a few minutes ago about the concerns you have about the lack of an asylum application, which is also called an I589. Is that right that an asylum application is called an I589?
 - A. Yes, it is, Counselor.
- Q. So why -- you mentioned that you have concerns to the fact that there's no asylum application under the IFR; is that right?
- A. I do have concerns. I don't remember whether I specifically stated that.
- Q. Right. My understanding is that you did have concerns. If I misspoke, I apologize.
- What are those concerns and why do you have them?
 - A. The concerns are many. One, the I589 is a document that is signed under oath in which the

2.2

2.3

Page 179

applicant averse to the duress in the statements that are made therein.

It also lays out the questions that are pertinent to the asylum withholding and CAT process with respect to that application. So you check boxes that say, I'm seeking asylum based upon particular social group or something like that.

That is a document that can then be used to challenge statements that are made in the course of the proceedings. In fact, it's very common for credibility determinations to be made based upon inconsistencies between the asylum application and the testimony of the respondent or applicant.

- Q. And you talk about some of this in paragraph 95, right?
- A. I'll take a look. Yes, I allude to this, but I talk about the difference of -- 95 actually has to deal with a slightly different issue.
- Q. It says in the second line "Eliminating the requirement for applicants to file an asylum application will almost inherently increase the asylum grant rate."
- A. Yeah, it will do so in a number of different ways; one of which is what I just described before with respect to the asylum grant rate, but it

2.2

2.3

Page 180

also goes on to say that a number of individuals who end up in immigration court -- immigration court with respect to following a credible fear determination don't actually file applications for asylum, and therefore they don't get asylum.

- Q. You said almost inherently in paragraph 95. Why did you say almost? Why not just say inherently?
- A. I don't want to speculate too far in the future. Plainly, it would change the grant rate.
- Q. So does that mean that you do want to speculate a little bit into the future?
- A. It all depends upon whether they stick to the procedure in this rule or whether they go back to the I589 rule.

Congress drafted section 208 or amended section 208 of the INA prefaced upon the fact that there would be an I589. They refer to the application and the I589 was a preexisting application at the time that they made that statement, which was in September 1996.

- Q. Is paragraph 95 speculation?
- A. No, it's not at all because, again, as I referenced before, there are a number of individuals, 38 out of 100, who do not file I589s and, for that reason, don't get granted asylum.

- Q. In paragraph 95 there's no citation or footnote, is there?
- A. I believe that I've referred back to that document. That's a DOJ document that is on the EOIR website, but I believe that I referred to it elsewhere in the applications marked in the evidence in this case.
 - Q. Does paragraph 95 refer to that?
 - A. It does not, Counsel.

2.2

- Q. Okay. So do you have any evidence to show that it's inherently going to increase the asylum grant rate?
 - MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Asked and answered.

THE WITNESS: The statements that I just made before are the reasons why it will increase the grant rate. There is no document upon which the veracity of the alien -- as you know,

Congress has made clear in section 208 of the INA, in the Real Idea Act, that that is a credibility assessment because Congress was concerned about credibility.

If you take away that application, that is one more thing that is not available to the -- to any adjudicator to question the respondent

Page 182 1 with respect to. 2 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 3 Ο. Okay. And again --Also, 38 out of 100 of them never file 4 Α. 5 589s. 6 Ο. So --7 And it's a period FY 2018 to the fourth 8 quarter of FY 2019. 9 Let's go to the next paragraph, please. Ο. 10 I'll read it here. It's one sentence. 11 says, "Regardless, even if the grant rate did not 12 increase, the asylum IFR would necessarily impact 13 states by speeding grants of asylum and thereby increasing eligibility for certain public benefits." 14 15 Did I read that accurately? 16 You did, Counsel. Α. 17 0. Okay. Thank you. And do you have any 18 footnotes or citations in paragraph 96? 19 No, but I believe that that is cumulative Α. 20 of other statements that I make in the application --21 or in the expert report. 2.2 But you don't refer to those in paragraph 0. 23 96, do you? 24 I do not, Counsel. Α. 25 Q. Let me ask you a bit about the substance

there. If the grant -- you're saying, even if the grant rate did not increase, you're saying that speeding grants of asylum would have an effect, right?

A. That's correct, Counsel.

2.2

2.3

- Q. And you're saying it's speeding because of the IFR, right? That's what you put in line one there?
 - A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. Does the speediness, to use a slightly different word, of the IFR that you're concerned about here, even if it leads to more grants, wouldn't it also by its speediness lead to an increased number of denials -- an increased rate of denials?
- A. No. Actually, because for -- denial isn't the right term. I believe that they -- yeah, denial would be correct in this context because the case would then go to the immigration court for further adjudication, and then to the board of immigration, appeals, potentially to the Court of Appeals under section 2.2.

So there are more avenues for denial than there are for a grant.

Q. Okay. Do all of the cases go to the immigration court that have been denied by the AO

under the IFR?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. Under the IFR, the applicant actually has the ability to miss one application or one interview at least and then be interviewed again, and then the IFR sets up a process by which those cases in which asylum is not granted are referred over to the immigration court.
- Q. Is it your understanding that some people after the initial denial say, okay?
- A. It's not -- it's not set forth in the IFR. Given the fact that the IFR permits them to be released, they would probably say there is nothing in the IFR that requires them to be detained.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you.

Are there statistics that you know about that talk about the current speed of rates of granting, let's say the current efficiency of granting under the IFR?

- A. With respect to time?
- Q. That's right.
- A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. Still talking about the IFR. I'm going to change angles a little bit here. How are we on timing? I'm sorry? Do you need a break, sir? It's 3 o'clock now.

- A. No. We can keep going.
- Q. We can keep going? Okay. Great. Thanks.
- 3 And folks here are okay? Ms. Marsh?
- 4 COURT REPORTER: I'm fine.

5 BY MR. SCHULTZ:

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q. Very good. So again, still on the IFR but a slightly different angle I'm going to be talking about here.

First let's go to paragraph 93, back a couple of ticks, please, and one of the numbers there on the second sentence, you say, "Between June and September of 2022, asylum" -- I'm sorry, I'm sorry. I asked for the first half of that.

Let me ask about the second half of that sentence there where you have the number about 572 AMIs, right?

- A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. Where did you get that number from, please?
- A. That's from the asylum cohort report that was issued by DHS.
- Q. Okay. And is that a number that you lifted directly from it or did you perform calculations on that data to get that number?
 - A. I had to calculate the numbers.
 - Q. Okay. Do you walk through that calculation

Page 186 1 here in paragraph 93? 2 Sure. So if you take 57 -- by the way, Α. 3 Counsel, I will tell you, math is sometimes a -- not my strong point, but if you take 110 referrals and 4 5 you add 49 grants, you get to 159 and then if you 6 deny the or divide the 49 by the 159, you get to the 7 number. 8 Q. Okay. 9 MR. ST. JOHN: For the record --BY MR. SCHULTZ: 10 11 There's some crosstalk there. Judge 0. 12 Arthur, if you could finish please and then Scott. 13 Α. That was it. MR. ST. JOHN: Judge, you made a couple of 14 15 statements. We're on a transcript. It doesn't 16 reflect intonation. 17 I assume you were joking about your math 18 ability, that you have the ability to do basic 19 arithmetic? 20 MR. SCHULTZ: Scott, are you testifying 21 here? 2.2 MR. ST. JOHN: Counsel, you know, you made 23 a big statement about not wanting to record it. 24 I tell you what we're going to do. I'm going to

start recording this. I think you noticed the

Page 187 1 deposition as being recordable. 2 If we're going to -- if you're going to 3 play games with the witness -- a witness making 4 an obvious joke, I want to protect the record 5 from that. If you're going to play games, I'll turn on 6 7 the recording and then we can play the recording 8 when you try to do this in court. 9 MR. SCHULTZ: Scott, first of all, I'm not 10 playing games. All I said is that you can't 11 testify. 12 MR. ST. JOHN: I will protect my record. Ι 13 will protect the record. I'm not testifying. I want a clean record for Mr. Arthur. 14 15 And Counsel, do you disagree that -- let's 16 chat. Do you disagree that Mr. Arthur was 17 joking based on his intonation? 18 MR. SCHULTZ: Counsel, this isn't the time 19 or place for this sort of exchange. All I said is, please don't testify. 20 21 MR. ST. JOHN: Counsel, for the record, we are going to start recording this. 2.2 23 MR. SCHULTZ: Okay. I am going to object 24 to the recording there please, Counsel.

MR. ST. JOHN: Did you notice the

Page 188 1 deposition saying it could be video or audio 2 recorded? 3 MR. SCHULTZ: That was by us, is I think 4 the common way to read that, sir. 5 MR. ST. JOHN: Well, any party can do it, 6 so we're going to do it, given your conduct just 7 now and given your prior conduct. 8 MR. SCHULTZ: Well, there is no prior 9 conduct to object about. This there is no current conduct by me to object about. 10 11 I simply asked you as counsel not to 12 testify, please. That was my request, sir. 13 So let's do this. It is 3:08. And we're 14 going to go off the record for a little bit. 15 Let's say five minutes, please. Thank you. 16 We're off the record at 3:08. 17 (RECESS TAKEN.) 18 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 19 It's 3:18. We're back on the record. Q. 20 you set? 21 Α. Yes, I am. 2.2 So just a couple quick notes. First of Ο. 23 all, we just want to make a couple objections, first 24 to the speaking objection and also -- I'm sorry, we 25 are objecting to your speaking objection.

2.2

2.3

Page 189

addition, I am objecting to any coaching or correction of testimony. And third, I'm objecting to any partial recording of the deposition that's been going on for hours already. Those are my objections. Going on to the next question.

MR. ST. JOHN: May I for the record, for the record, I think it's important that the court has made clear to the United States, to Ms. Ryan, who I understand is sitting in the room, not to play games.

The witness made an obvious joke. Although the United States noticed a recorded deposition, they chose not to record. And when I made a statement for the record that the witness had just made an obvious joke based on his intonation, I was chewed out by Mr. Schultz.

That reflects that Mr. Schultz intends to play games with the transcript. So we have been forced to record in order to prevent the United States from playing games.

It's unfortunate. This has been the second instance in this deposition where Mr. Schultz used sharp practices. The first time was an attempt to mislead the witness by make statements and offering alternatives that the

2.3

Page 190

people sitting next to Mr. Schultz know are false.

The plaintiff and state will not tolerate such sharp practices. If we need to reach out to the court, we will. It's unfortunate that we've been put in this deposition position, but let's proceed with the deposition.

MR. SCHULTZ: Let's proceed with the deposition. I do disagree with some of the statements that you made, but let's go forward.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

Q. So let's turn to paragraph 93, please,
Judge, and that's where we were before, but it's a
different part of it.

So at the end there, there's a sentence, very last sentence in paragraph 93, it says, "I concluded that AOs have granted asylum in nearly 31 percent of the border cases that they heard to completion, i.e., almost twice as often as IJs historically had."

And then there's a footnote that leads to something that you wrote for CIS; is that accurate what I just said?

- A. That's correct, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. So when you write about the -- in

that last phrase, almost twice as often as IJs historically had, is it fair to say that you're talking about the rates that IJs, immigration judges, have historically granted asylum? Is that what you're referring to in that phrase?

- A. Yes, Counsel. It should be reflected in my -- in the blog post that is referenced.
- Q. You're talking about the rate. That's what I want to use as my starting point there. Right?
 - A. Correct, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Thank you. So when you say historically, what frame of years are you looking at there, please?
- A. I'd have to go back to the blog post itself to actually give you an exact answer.
 - Q. But you don't know that right now?
 - A. I don't know it off the top of my head.
- Q. Okay. Do you have any source for that statement aside from your own blog post?
- A. For the statement it would be based upon

 Department of Justice Executive Office For

 Immigration Review statistics that are available on their website.
- Q. But their website wouldn't say how long you're looking at when you say historically, would it?

Page 192 1 It would not, Counsel. Α. 2 That's your phrasing, right, historically? Q. 3 Α. That's correct, Counsel. Okay. I'm just trying to figure out how 4 Q. you came to the conclusion of what that number might 5 6 be. Okay. 7 So let's look at footnote 47 there on page 8 25 if you can, please. Okay? 9 Α. Yes, Counsel. 10 And we have a copy of that here that I'm Ο. 11 going to put in as Exhibit No. 4, please. And we are 12 going to show that to you in just a moment. 13 you for your patience while we do that. 14 (EXHIBIT NO. 4 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) BY MR. SCHULTZ: 15 16 Q. There we go. Can you see that on your 17 screen, Judge Arthur? 18 Mine is blank, Counsel. There it is. Α. 19 Q. Okay. Great. 20 MR. SCHULTZ: And Scott, can you see that 21 as well? 2.2 MR. ST. JOHN: I can. 23 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 24 And that's a one-page Ο. Okay. Great. 25 document, if you scroll down to show that, please.

It's just the one page there, okay?

A. Correct. Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Q. Okay. So I'm going to ask a question, then I'm going to suggest where you might find the answer. That's just for your own help. You don't need to follow my suggestion.

Does the data indicate in that chart, does that show data for all initial asylum decisions by immigration judges? And if you look at footnote one, that might help with your answer, if you scroll down to footnote one.

A. I believe that that is all adjudication.

MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. The document speaks for itself.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

Q. Okay. Now, I have a question before we go forward.

For Asylum Merits Interviews, under the Interim Final Rule, do those always take place after there's been a Credible Fear Interview?

- A. They do, Counsel. It's a condition precedent.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. But that document here that you cited in footnote 47, that isn't limited to cases in immigration court where there's been a

Credible Fear Interview, is there?

- A. It does not, Counsel.
- O. Okay. So --

2.2

2.3

- A. I apologize, there is another document that actually talks about adjudications after Credible Fear Interviews.
- Q. And no need to apologize at all. I think we're both heading into the same direction.

So is it fair to say then that that -looking at this document here as an indication of
what immigration judges do with asylum cases, is it
fair to say it's not really an apples to apples
comparison because this includes cases where there
hasn't been a Credible Fear Interview?

- A. Well, it does indicate that from 2022 to the third quarter of 2023, it's 14.79 percent, but it's not an apples to apples, but it is -- it does reflect immigration decisions or asylum decisions by the judges at large.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you.

So you mentioned there was another document, and we're going to pull up what I think you might be thinking of, but you can tell me. And we're going to call that Exhibit No. 5 and we're going to put that on in just a moment, please. So thank you

Page 195 1 for your patience. 2 And Judge, no need to apologize at all, but 3 what you're saying is always helpful. Thank you so much. 4 5 Α. I can see the document. (EXHIBIT NO. 5 MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 6 7 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 8 Q. Okay. 9 I apologize, that's the document that I'm referencing. 10 Okay. Good. So this is Exhibit No. 5. 11 Ο. 12 This is a public document, by the way. It is a very 13 long and cumbersome web page, which even reading into the record is cumbersome. 14 15 Do you know how to get this document, Judge 16 Arthur? 17 Α. I do, Counsel. 18 Okay. So let's then look at this document. Q. 19 And just my eyesight is not as good as I wish it 20 I'm standing up and getting closer. 21 At the top of the document, in light blue, 2.2 does it say, "Asylum decision and filing rates in 23 cases originating with a credible fear claim"? Do 24 you see that in light blue? 25 Α. It does, Counsel.

Q. Okay. Thank you. And is that a more limited set of data -- I'm sorry, is the chart reflected here, does that come from a more limited set of data than what we saw in the first chart a moment ago?

MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. The document

MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. The document speaks for itself.

THE WITNESS: It does, Counsel.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Thank you, Judge. And is this the document that you said you had in mind?
 - A. That is the one, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. And would using this document give an apples to apples comparison to asylum officer decisions made in Asylum Merits

 Interviews under the -- under the Interim Final Rule?
 - A. It would, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. Why didn't you use this document or some version or some earlier version of this document in your expert report?
- A. Because my knowledge of this is expanding with respect to the document in question that I cited directly to a blog post that I had written.
- Q. When you say your knowledge of this is expanding, can you clarify what you mean by that,

please? I don't know that I followed.

2.2

2.3

- A. I apologize. This is what I do for a living, Mr. Schultz. I'm constantly finding data points to explain immigration issues to the public, and to other individuals.
- Q. I see. So is it fair to say you didn't know about this document -- you didn't know about this chart when you wrote your expert report?
- A. It wasn't the one that I relied upon when I wrote the -- I can't remember whether I knew about it or not. EOIR's website is a little cumbersome, as you mentioned, with respect to the documents that are available.
- Q. I'm not sure I mentioned that, but thank you.
- A. I apologize, I thought you actually used the term cumbersome. But yeah, there were a number of documents on there and sometimes new documents are added. Sometimes they come off. I believe this document actually has been there.
- Q. I think I understand now where you came from. I said that the web address was cumbersome, not that the navigation on the website was cumbersome. I just mean there's a lot of dashes and such on the web address on that chart. Thank you for

Page 198 1 clarifying that. Thank you. 2 And you didn't use this anywhere in your 3 report, did you, this second chart? To the best of my knowledge, I did not. 4 Α. 5 Q. Thank you so much. Okay. 6 Let's move on a little bit to paragraph 7 100. That's on page --8 Α. Sorry. 9 0. I'm sorry, everyone okay? We can take down Judge, are you still there? 10 the chart now, yes. 11 I'm still here. Α. 12 I thought I heard a noise. Q. 13 Α. Yeah, I dropped my binder. 14 0. I see. Are you all set now? 15 Yes. Go ahead. Α. I am. 16 Q. So paragraph 100, let me make sure I have 17 the right words here for a moment. 18 In the first sentence you write, "The 19 presence of asylum applicants in Louisiana and 20 Florida is implicitly confirmed by pronouncements regarding the asylum IFR itself." 21 2.2 Did I read that right? 2.3 Α. You did Counsel. 24 Okay. What do you mean by implicitly Q. confirmed? 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Page 199

- A. Because they talk about the fact that, in this instance Miami would be an office, as would later on New Orleans. And the way that the IFR assigns the cases, at least initially, is to places near where AMIs are being performed.
- Q. Is there any distinction between implicitly confirmed versus just confirmed?
- A. I guess, honestly, in that particular instance, no. Tacitly confirmed probably would have been a more artful way of saying it.
- Q. Now, you mentioned that that was because of the information, I guess, that's later in that same paragraph, that would include New Orleans and Miami, right?
 - A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. Has that begun yet in New Orleans yet, to your knowledge?
- A. There have been six interviews that I'm aware of.
 - Q. Six interviews in New Orleans?
- A. Six that eventually -- four were denials and two were administratively closed.
- Q. And those are Asylum Merits Interviews under the Interim Final Rule; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct, Counsel.

1 To your knowledge, have there been any Q. 2 Asylum Merits Interviews under the Interim Final Rule in Miami so far? 3 I would need to take a look at the Interim 4 5 Final Rule, to the asylum cohort with respect to 6 Miami, but to the best of my knowledge there are. 7 Q. There are? 8 Α. There have been, yes. 9 Ο. There have been. Okay. But do you have some sense of how many? And if you don't, that's 10 11 fine. 12 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Best evidence 13 rule. 14 THE WITNESS: I don't. BY MR. SCHULTZ: 15 16 Okay. I was asking what he knew, not what Q. 17 was in the document. Thank you so much, Judge. 18 If you go to the end of that paragraph now, 19 please, so instead of the first sentence, the last 20 sentence, it reads, quote, "In a June 2023 cohort, 21 report indicates the asylum IFR has been applied to 2.2 cases in Miami and New Orleans." 23 Do you see that? 24 I do, Counsel. Α. 25 Q. Did I read that accurately?

A. You did, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Similar question: What do you mean by apply to cases, be applied to cases? Can you expand on that, please?
- A. Yeah. They have performed IFR interviews in those places.
- Q. You just mean that the rule has gone into effect there?
 - A. Correct, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Now, does that report that you talked about talk about any expenditures of money by the state of Louisiana?
 - A. It does not, Counsel.
 - Q. And what about for Florida?
- A. It does not. It is simply a document that reflects how many interviews have been completed, how many were referred, how many were closed, and how many were denied or how many were granted, how many were referred and how many were administratively closed.
- Q. All right. Let's go on a little bit to a couple of paragraphs down, to paragraph 105. You wrote, "I am informed that Louisiana's obligated by its state constitution to fund education." Then it goes on.

Page 202 1 Do you see that phrase where it says, "I am 2 informed"? 3 Α. That is correct, Counsel. So let me take a couple of steps back. 4 Ο. 5 just wanted to give you that to orient you to where my questions are going to be heading right now. 6 7 just realized one thing I need to check here. Okay. You were a 30(b)(6) witness in this 8 9 case. We talked about that earlier, right? 10 Α. That's correct, Counsel. 11 So let me just ask you generally first and Ο. 12 then we can kind of go from there. In what context 13 were you informed about Louisiana, as you wrote in 14 paragraph 105? 15 I was informed by the attorney general's 16 office at that time. 17 Ο. And when you say "at that time," what do 18 you mean, please? 19 I've subsequently spoken to the Department Α. of Education in Louisiana. 20 21 Ο. I still don't understand what you meant when you said "at that time." Was there a 2.2 2.3 specific time frame that you were referring to? 24 Yes, at the time that I issued this report. Α.

25

Q.

I see.

Okay.

I need to pause for a second here, please.

Thank you.

Let's go to the last sentence there. It says, "I am further informed that additional state funding is allocated based on certain student characteristics, one of which is the English Language Learner."

Do you see that?

A. I do, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

- Q. Was that information that you were given or a conclusion that you were given?
 - A. That was information that I was provided.
- Q. Okay. And what information exactly were you provided?
- A. That the funding per student is \$4,015, under the FMAP, and then there are variations in that.
- Q. Okay. And what was the source of that information, please? You had mentioned both information and the state attorney general's office. Can you tell me which was the source, please?
 - A. The state attorney general's office.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. And for paragraph 106, there's a similar phrasing about Florida. It says, "I am informed that Florida is similarly obligated,"

- and then it goes on with what you wrote in 106.
- When you said -- when you wrote "I am
- informed, who informed you, please?
 - A. The attorney general's office of the state of Louisiana.
 - Q. And --

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. And I've since confirmed both of those facts with the Department of Education.
 - Q. Of Louisiana?
 - A. Of Louisiana.
- Q. So you confirmed with the Department of

 Education of Louisiana what the Florida constitution

 does?
- 14 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Vague.
- 15 BY MR. SCHULTZ:
- Q. You can answer, please.
 - A. With respect to the -- with the Florida constitution, that one, I have been informed by the attorney general's office of Louisiana.
 - Q. Again, I'm just trying to get at, so for all of this it wasn't Florida that gave it to you, it was Louisiana that gave it to you, right?
 - A. Yes, it was, Counsel.
 - Q. Okay. And there's various other places in your report where you have that phrasing, "I am

- informed." For all of those, was it from the attorney general of Louisiana?
 - A. It was, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Q. Thank you. If you look at paragraph -- I'm sorry, if you look at footnotes 58 to 63, those are the ones at the bottom of page 28. There's just a list of them there running from 58 to 63.

Do you see those?

- A. Correct, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Do those sources mention the number of people whose presence in Louisiana can be attributed to the IFR?
- A. They do not. That information is not available to the state of Louisiana or to me, because under 8 CFR 208.6, information that's contained inside Credible Fear Interviews and Asylum Interviews is not for public disclosure, and that includes through the state.
- Q. Do you know if Louisiana has the ability to track who is or isn't a parolee in those numbers?
 - A. With respect to education?
 - O. Correct.
- A. Under Plyler versus Doe, which is a Supreme Court case, the state is required to provide education to every resident of the state who request

- it. And DOJ -- the civil division of DOJ and the Department of Education have sent letters to state officials warning them not to inquire into the immigration status of individuals, whether they have legal status or whether they don't.
- Q. And is it your understanding that Louisiana follows that -- follows the -- follows what was offered in that letter?
 - A. Yes, they do.

2.2

2.3

Q. Thank you. Let's turn to paragraph 110, please, the next one up -- the next page up, I should say, on page 29.

And it starts off in the first sentence talking about a natural experiment involving enrollment of defined group -- I'm sorry, enrollment of a defined group of migrant children, also provides some insight. And the next two words say that it took place in 2014.

Do you see that?

- A. Do I -- I see where it says 2014 to begin with.
- Q. Okay. So if you look at paragraph 110, on the second line down there, which is line four of the page, the second sentence there begins in 2014.
 - A. Correct, Counsel. I thought you said that

2014 had been referenced twice.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. If I did, I apologize. But thank you.
- I was trying to pull it onto your awareness that this is a time frame in 2014 that you're talking about in paragraph 110; is that accurate?
- A. That is accurate, that was a rather well-publicized request that Senator Vitter had made.
- Q. Okay. And I just was hoping you could please explain to me why you're talking about a 2014 phenomena when the IFR didn't come into existence for years after that?
- A. It establishes the fact that unaccompanied alien children have imposed cost on the state of Louisiana with respect to their enrollment in school, indicative of the fact that students without status have in fact enrolled in Louisiana schools.
- Q. Okay. But this all took place years before the IFR was even proposed, right?
 - A. Correct, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. And going to the next paragraph, it starts off with the words "There can be little doubt that alien children impose education cost on Florida and Louisiana even if those costs are difficult to quantify precisely."

Do you see where those words are?

Page 208 1 Α. I do, Counsel. 2 Q. And did I read those correctly? 3 Α. You did, Counsel. 4 Q. Okay. Thanks. 5 So a couple of questions about that. First 6 of all, I'm sorry, following that -- immediately 7 following that sentence there is no footnote, is 8 there? 9 The remainder of that paragraph explains Α. 10 that. 11 Okay. But Mr. Arthur, there is no footnote Ο. 12 immediately following that sentence, right? 13 MR. ST. JOHN: Objection. Asked and 14 answered. 15 THE WITNESS: There is no footnote, 16 Counsel. 17 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 18 I'm sorry, I think that the connection just Q. 19 stuttered there for a moment. If you could just 20 repeat what you said. I couldn't hear. 21 Α. There is no footnote accompanying it. 2.2 Q. Okay. Thank you. 23 The rest of the paragraph explains it. Α. 24 Okay. Thank you. And there's one footnote Q. 25 in that paragraph and it's one of your -- it's to a

CIS report, right, number 66?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. Now, you say at the end of that paragraph, "As former acting Secretary of Homeland Security, Chad Wolf, testified earlier this year."

Chad Wolf wasn't acting Secretary of Homeland Security in 2023, was he?

- A. It is modified by the word "former."
- Q. Oh, I see. He testified as the former, not -- okay. Thank you for clarifying.

And where was -- where or when did that testimony take place? I don't see a footnote for that either.

- A. I've got to think about that. At the moment, I can't remember when that testimony took place.
- Q. Okay. When you write at the top of that paragraph "There can be little doubt," does that mean that there can be some doubt?
- A. The language is probably imprecise. There can be no doubt.
 - Q. That's not what you wrote here, is it?
 - A. No, it's not, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. And the second part of that opening sentence, you say that "Those costs are difficult to

quantify precisely."

2.2

2.3

Do you see that?

- A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. Okay. How could there be little doubt when it's so hard to quantify?
- A. Because of the structure of the law, because of the presence of aliens and alien children in the state of Louisiana, and because of the fact it can't be quantified because under Plyler versus Doe and the DOJ civil division -- actually, I think it was civil rights division and DOE, Department of Education letter, they're not allowed to ask about the immigration status of the students of their schools.
- Q. Thank you. And I do understand that you're saying it's difficult to quantify. What I'm getting at, which I'm not sure you quite addressed, was given that it's so difficult to quantify, how can you have little to no doubt?
- A. Because there are immigrant students who are present in Louisiana, based upon it's cumulative of Senator Vitters' request, because of Plyler versus Doe, because they can't ask about the immigration status of the children in the schools.
 - Q. Okay. Let's go forward a little bit.

Let's make sure. Paragraphs 117 through 128, if you can just look at those, please, and let me know once you've familiarized yourself with them.

A. Yes, Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Okay. I didn't see any mention of the IFL in those paragraphs. Did I miss that?
 - A. It is not in there, Counsel.
 - Q. Okay. Why not?
- A. The theory of my report, the basis of my report is that by increasing the number of aliens who will be released in the United States, it will increase the -- and by expediting the process by which those individuals would be granted asylum, that it would impose additional costs on the state of Louisiana.
- Q. And moving forward a little bit to paragraph 129, let's skip that. Let's skip that.
- A. That's the paragraph that actually summarizes the point I just made.
 - Q. Okay. Very good. Thank you.

So at the end of your report, or so your report -- I think this is what you have in front of you -- ends at page 37; is that right?

- A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. And it has a signature line that says

1 Andrew Arthur and what looks like a signature. 2 That's your signature, right? 3 Α. It is, correct, Counsel. And then that's where your current copy in 4 Ο. 5 front of you ends; is that right? That is the one that I signed. That is the 6 Α. 7 current one that I signed based upon my knowledge at the time that I signed everything. 8 9 Ο. Okay. And that's where yours ends too, right, at page 37, I think? 10 11 It is. Α. 12 Q. You said the core report, right? 13 MR. ST. JOHN: The report is the report. I 14 mean, you know, he -- I mean, the total report 15 is I wanted to say 100-something pages. 16 MR. SCHULTZ: I thought that was your 17 phrase from before. I thought I heard you say 18 core report before. 19 MR. ST. JOHN: Thankfully I'm not the 20 witness. 21 MR. SCHULTZ: Really all I'm getting at is yours ends at page 37, right? 2.2 23 MR. ST. JOHN: That's where the document I 24 have in front of me ends. 25 MR. SCHULTZ: That's all I'm asking.

BY MR. SCHULTZ:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Q. So the document that I have in front of me goes on. It has Exhibit A, which we talked about before, which we showed you. That was the -- what you called your CV.

Do you remember talking about that?

- A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. There's also an Exhibit B that I have here.

 Do you remember that there was an Exhibit B?
- A. I believe the Exhibit B is my comment in response to the JNPRN.
- Q. Okay. So do you have a copy of that in front of you?
 - A. I do not.
- Q. Okay. So I have it dated October 28, 2021.

 Does that sound right?
 - A. That does sound correct, Counsel.
- Q. Was that written before you signed your contract with the state of Louisiana to be an expert in this case?
- A. That was in response to the JNPRN. Yes, it should have been.
 - Q. It should have been?
- A. It should have been because the JNPRN predated the IFR and the IFR is what I was hired to

Case 6:22-cv-01130-DCJ-CBW Document 214-19 Filed 12/22/23 Page 214 of 315 Page ID #: Andrew Arthur Page 214 1 offer expert testimony on. 2 Okay. And I'm not sure that I followed the Q. 3 answer there, and I apologize if I wasn't clear. JNPRM is Joint Notice of Proposed 4 Α. 5 Rulemaking. I appreciate that. Thank you. My question 6 Ο. 7 is just about the dates. My question is, did you sign your contract with Louisiana before or after 8 9 October 18, 2021? 10 It would have been after. 11 Ο. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. 12 And were you paid to write this Exhibit B 13 by anyone? It is part of my responsibilities at the 14 15 Center For Immigration Studies. 16 Q. Okay. Did the state of Louisiana pay you 17 to write that letter? 18 They did not. Α. 19 Did the state of Florida pay you to write Q. it? 20 21 Α. They did not, Counsel. 2.2 Did any plaintiff in the case pay you to Q. write it? 2.3 24 Α. No.

Do you know who Robert Law is?

25

Q.

- A. Robert Law is a former colleague of mine at the Center For Immigration Studies.

 Q. Did Robert Law help you write the letter
- Q. Did Robert Law help you write the letter dated October 18, 2021?
 - A. He did not.

I'm sorry, what was the date on that one?

- Q. October 18, 2021.
- A. Yes.
- Q. So just for a clear record, I'll ask the question again.

Did Robert Law help you write the letter
dated October 18, 2021?

- A. Yes, he did, Counsel.
- 14 Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- A. By the way, it's not a letter. It's a comment. It's in the form of a letter, but under filing it's technically a comment.
- Q. Thank you. It's framed as a letter, so that's why I was referring to it that way, but I'm happy to call it a comment. That's just fine. Thank you for clarifying.

And do you know who Julie Axelrod is?

- A. I do.
- Q. Did Julie Axelrod write this comment with you as well?

A. She did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. Is Robert Law an expert who's been hired by the plaintiffs in this case?
 - A. He is not.
- Q. Okay. And is Julie Axelrod an expert who's been hired by the plaintiffs in this case?
 - A. It is not.
 - Q. Do you mean she is not?
 - A. I apologize. She is not. Sorry.
 - O. Thank you so much.

How did you come to write this letter, the October 18th comments, I should say?

- A. Well, the comment was written in response to the interim, the Joint Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. Part of the Center's job -- part of what we do, part of the reason that we exist is to inform the public with respect to immigration issues.

 Consistent with that is informing -- is responding to proposed rulemaking.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. Was it your idea to write the letter or do you remember exactly how the mechanics worked out on who thought to do it first?
- A. Honestly, I don't remember. It was the -I can remember the mechanics of it very well. Rob
 Law produced more or less the structure of it. Julie

Page 217 1 Axelrod produced a portion at the end, but the vast 2 majority of work in that comment are mine. 3 Ο. Okay. We generally respond to notices of proposed 4 5 rulemaking that are submitted or that are issued by 6 the administration, both this administration and the 7 prior one. 8 Q. Okay. Thank you. I'm going to take a 9 moment here and go on mute. Thank you. 10 Thanks, Counsel. Α. 11 (OFF THE RECORD.) 12 It's 4:02, so we're back on MR. SCHULTZ: the record now. So those are the questions that 13 Scott, if you are planning to ask 14 15 questions, then of course that's fine. 16 let's take five minutes before we do that, if 17 that's what you want to do. 18 MR. ST. JOHN: Okay. Off the record. 19 MR. SCHULTZ: You're going to do the 20 questions then, yes? 21 MR. ST. JOHN: Yes. It is 4:02. Back in 2.2 five minutes. Thank you all. 23 (RECESS TAKEN.) 24 EXAMINATION

25

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

- Q. Welcome back, Judge Arthur.
- A. Thank you, sir.

2.2

2.3

- Q. Mr. Schultz at times talked about push and pull factors, analysis, modeling. Do you know if there is a group within the Department of Homeland Security that does any type of analysis or modeling of migrant flows?
- A. There is -- identifying the migrant flow in advance is critical to the mission of CBP and border patrol in particular. And in fact, in the Circumvention of Lawful Pathways Rule, the interim version that was issued in February, they specifically referenced the fact that they do track that information or that there is an organization within the department that tracks that information.
- Q. To your knowledge, is the concept of push and pull factors generally accepted among immigration experts?
 - A. It is, Counsel.
- Q. The your knowledge, does the Department of Homeland Security rely on push and pull factors in making the analysis you just testified about?
- A. There is -- again, there is a robust -- there is a robust team within DHS that performs those analyses, but I didn't see reference to any of those

analyses in this particular IFR.

- Q. And presumably, the results of that team are sufficiently reliable that the United States Government relies upon them, correct?
 - A. They are.

2.2

2.3

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: They are sufficiently reliable. This is an effort that's been going on for years. Familiar with it when I was at the INS and also familiar with it when I was on the hill.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

- Q. So you talked about statistics a little bit. Presumably, they collect -- well, not presumably, you know, there's actually a statutory requirement that the federal government collects certain statistics about the border, correct?
- A. That is correct. I can't cite to the specific statute, but they do collect it. And in fact, it goes into modeling that was required or it goes into analyses that were required under the NDA, National Defense Authorization Act of 2017, which I think is now at 6 U.S. Code 223. And they produce an annual report that's provided under the government accountability office.

1 And forgive me if I'm wrong, my Q. 2 recollection is that the statistics include border 3 encounters, correct? That is correct, Counsel. 4 Α. 5 Gotaways, which is a statutorily defined 0. 6 term, correct? 7 Α. It's statutorily defined in 6 USC 223. And estimates of what I would call unknown 8 Q. 9 gotaways? There is generally a factor that is 10 11 commonly accepted. In fact, in testimony before, I 12 believe it was the house oversight committee in 13 March, then-chief -- Border Patrol Chief Ortiz actually talked about a 10 percent or 20 percent --14 15 10 percent to 20 percent assumption that there are 16 unknown gotaways. 17 And so to really model or understand the 18 border flow, you have -- migrant flow across the 19 United States border, you would have to look at all 20 of those, correct? 21 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 2.2 THE WITNESS: To model those, yes. 2.3 fact, they're kept in realtime and accessible to 24 the department in realtime on a daily basis.

When I say in realtime, I mean on a daily

25

Page 221 1 basis. BY MR. ST. JOHN: 2 3 Are you familiar -- there was -- well, 0. strike that. 4 5 At some point either you testified or 6 Mr. Schultz asked about TRAC, T-R-A-C. What is TRAC? 7 Α. It's the Transactional Records Access 8 Center in Syracuse University. 9 Where does TRAC get its data? Ο. From FOIA, Freedom of Information Act, 10 11 requests that they make of the federal government. 12 So TRAC's data is purely derivative of data Q. that the federal government has in its possession? 13 That's where the FOIA disclosures 14 Α. 15 come from. 16 Do you know if TRAC data is generally Ο. 17 accurate or not? 18 Could you define "generally accurate"? Α. 19 Well, are you aware of any significant Q. errors in TRAC data? 20 21 With respect to they keep track of -- track with a K in this instance -- of asylum or immigration 2.2 2.3 judge asylum grant rates. And I believe that they do

actually underestimate -- they did actually

underestimate the number of asylum cases that I

24

25

- handled. That's the -- that is one that is specific to me.
- Q. What did TRAC show as far as the number of immigration cases you handled, Judge?
- A. It's been a while since I looked at that data. It's been a long time since I looked at that data, but I thought that the TRAC data showed that I had performed a couple hundred asylum cases, wherein I know just from my recollection that it was much higher than that number.
 - Q. Much higher? A thousand? Two thousand?

 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: I didn't keep track of the number of asylum cases that I did, but I would generally do a number of asylum cases every week and I served as an immigration judge for eight years and a couple of months.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

2.2

2.3

- Q. Do you have an estimate, even a ballpark, a range of how many immigration cases you think you did?
- A. Yeah, I didn't keep a running tally of the number of asylum cases -- immigration or asylum cases.

With respect to asylum cases, I didn't keep

a running tally, but it was probably upwards of -again, it's going to be a really rough ballpark. It
was probably upwards of -- I want to say maybe five
hundred to a couple thousand.

And again, I apologize, when you adjudicate those cases, as Mr. Schultz will tell you, you do them in real time and you move on to the next one.

Q. If I wanted the real data, I would need to look to the federal government, not to TRAC, though, correct?

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: That is correct. The federal government actually maintains a list of all of the cases that I handled. There were codes. 05 is the code for asylum, and you could obtain that information with respect to me.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

2.2

2.3

Q. And that's true more generally -- is that true more generally of data TRAC maintained; you would look to the federal government for the definitive answer?

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: Yes. The federal government keeps very accurate records on that data.

Again, we talked before about the chart that

Page 224 1 Mr. Schultz had referenced. That is accurate 2 data because they do capture that 05. 3 In fact, I came across that chart in 4 response to some inquiries I had from 5 congressional staffers. BY MR. ST. JOHN: 6 7 Q. I'm going to shift gears. A few times 8 today Mr. Schultz said you were an expert in 9 immigration law. 10 Do you recall that? 11 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 12 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 13 BY MR. ST. JOHN: You're an immigration judge. 14 I assume it's Ο. 15 fair that you are in fact an expert in immigration 16 law? 17 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 18 BY MR. ST. JOHN: 19 Q. Is that fair? 20 Α. Not simply because I was an immigration 21 judge, but also because of my experience as a trial attorney as oversight counsel for immigration, and 2.2 23 because of my role as staff director at the house 24 committee on oversight and government reform, 25 national security subcommittee in which role I had

- jurisdiction over immigration for a chairman and a subcommittee chairman that were very interested in immigration.
- Q. But in this case, you're not just an expert on immigration law, I'd refer you to paragraph 13 of your expert report.

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

19

20

21

2.2

24

25

- Q. If you can read the first sentence of paragraph 13.
- A. "I am a recognized expert in the field of immigration, generally." Yes.
 - Q. In immigration policies, specifically?

 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

15 BY MR. ST. JOHN:

- Q. You can answer, Judge Arthur.
- A. Yes. With respect to immigration national security and specifically immigration policy.
 - Q. And within that, you have experience, I believe you testified earlier today, with respect to the impact of policies?

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

23 BY MR. ST. JOHN:

- Q. Is that correct?
- A. That is correct. Both because of my work

2.2

2.3

Page 226

at the Center For Immigration Studies and because of my role as oversight counsel for immigration on the House Judiciary Committee.

One of the big things that we looked at was impacts upon societies, particularly with respect to public benefits with respect to the wages and working conditions of Americans.

And just to clarify, by American, that term is defined as United States citizens and lawfully -- lawful immigrants who are eligible to work.

Q. And to make the analysis that you're talking about, looking at the impact of policy, you don't need to be -- necessarily be an expert in every program that an immigration policy would impact; is that correct?

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: That is correct, because one of things that immigration experts -- one of the things that I do, I don't want to speak for immigration experts generally -- is to look at the monetary cost of immigration in the United States, particularly with respect to localities.

This has become a key issue in response to complaints that have been raised by Mayor Eric Adams of New York City and other public

Page 227 1 officials about the cost that they are bearing with respect to the -- with respect to migrants 3 who have resettled in their areas. And my work 4 in that has been cited by Congress, by 5 congressional committees. 6 BY MR. ST. JOHN: 7 There has been an awful lot of talk about 8 footnotes today, Judge Arthur. 9 I apologize. Α. 10 Judge Arthur, has there been a lot of Ο. 11 discussion about footnotes today? 12 I thought that was a prefatory statement. Α. There has been, Counsel. 13 14 If I told you there were 50 states in the 15 union, would you need a footnote to accept that 16 statement as true? 17 No, I would not. Α. 18 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 19 THE WITNESS: I apologize, Counsel. I can 20 answer the question? 21 BY MR. ST. JOHN: 22 Ο. Yes, you may answer. 2.3 It is well-known and generally accepted that there are 50 states in the union. 24 25 If I told you Pearl Harbor was bombed by Ο.

Page 228 1 the Japanese on December 7, 1941, would you need a 2 footnote and a source to believe that? 3 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. THE WITNESS: No, I would not need a 4 5 footnote or a source to make that statement. BY MR. ST. JOHN: 6 7 Q. Let's go to something a little softer. 8 you familiar with a publication called Penthouse, 9 Penthouse magazine? I am familiar that it exists. 10 11 If I told you that Penthouse was a Ο. 12 pornographic magazine, would you need me to supply a footnote and a citation for the fact that Penthouse 13 14 is a pornographic magazine? 15 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 16 THE WITNESS: I would not need such a 17 It's generally accepted that that's 18 true. 19 BY MR. ST. JOHN: 20 To your knowledge, did a justice named Q. 21 Potter Stewart say something about that? 2.2 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 2.3 THE WITNESS: I apologize. I believe that 24 Potter Stewart's quote may have preexisted the

creation of Penthouse magazine, but Potter

25

Page 229 1 Stewart did make a rather famous statement, "I 2 know pornography when I see it." BY MR. ST. JOHN: 3 It's something that's obvious and you don't 4 5 need a citation, correct? That's correct. 6 Α. 7 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 8 THE WITNESS: I apologize. 9 Sorry, Counsel. Correct. BY MR. ST. JOHN: 10 11 When you're having a conversation, you 0. 12 don't source every sentence, do you? 13 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 14 THE WITNESS: I do not. 15 BY MR. ST. JOHN: 16 I remember a while back you and I were Ο. 17 chatting about the economics of World War II, and I 18 remember you were talking about a book by -- I think 19 it was by John Kenneth Galbraith. 20 Do you remember that conversation? 21 I do, Counsel. It was actually an analysis by John Kenneth Galbraith of the effects of bombing 2.2 23 on German industry during World War II. That's Right. I recall. 24 Q. 25 We talked for several minutes about that,

Page 230 1 correct? 2 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 3 THE WITNESS: Sorry. We actually did. can be a bit pedantic sometimes. 4 5 BY MR. ST. JOHN: 6 Ο. And did you preface every sentence with 7 "John Kenneth Galbraith said"? 8 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 9 THE WITNESS: I did not, Counsel. BY MR. ST. JOHN: 10 11 Because you and I both understood from the 0. 12 conversation exactly what you were talking about, 13 correct? MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 14 15 THE WITNESS: That's correct, Counsel. 16 BY MR. ST. JOHN: 17 At one point today, my recollection is that 18 you testified that an alien's ability to remain in 19 the United States may be a pull factor. 20 Let me ask you, do you agree with that 21 statement? 2.2 I do, without a doubt. By remain, to 23 clarify if I wasn't clear, to remain undetained in 24 this country, yes. 25 Q. That was the question I was going to ask.

Thank you, Judge.

2.2

2.3

Mr. Schultz asked you about paragraph 78 of your expert report, and it dealt with the 21-day resolution requirement or the 21-day calendar requirement under the asylum IFR.

Do you recall that line of questioning?

- A. I do recall that, Counsel.
- Q. Does that 21-day period in the asylum IFR interact with the Flores settlement agreement?

 MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: Yes. Actually, the IFR is applicable to family units as well as to single adults.

And just to re-clarify the record, under the district court order in August of 2015, in Flores versus Lynch, Judge Dolly Gee -- Madam Transcriber, that's D-o-l-l-y G-e-e -- mandated the release of adult migrants and children who entered in family units within 20 days.

That was clarified by the -- or that was on appeal by DOJ. The circuit court, the 9th circuit stated that the adults in those family units could be detained. The children would be released. But generally, in order to avoid family separation, everyone is released.

And in fact, there was a recent decision that was issued. It was the agreement of the immigration judge -- I'm sorry, Judge Dana Sabraw, S-a-b-r-a-w, extended that with respect to the detention of criminal aliens.

It was an agreement that said criminal aliens or aliens subject to criminal -- by criminal aliens, I mean aliens subject to criminal penalties from proper entry and proper reentry could not enter or could not be detained, with exceptions.

And the 21-day rule would actually push all FMUs then outside of the window for that AMI, Asylum Merits Interview.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

2.2

2.3

- Q. Let me try to narrow that down. Does that mean that a family -- an FMU could not be detained until their AMI?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Mr. Schultz in discussing paragraph 89 of your expert report, he asked you a good number of questions about the standard for credible fear, and that it's different within the standard for asylum.

Do you recall that line of questioning?

A. That is correct.

Page 233 1 How close are the two standards? Q. 2 For credible fear and asylum? Α. 3 Yes. Q. MR. SCHULTZ: Objection. 4 5 THE WITNESS: Counsel, I can't see you, so 6 I apologize. 7 Can I answer the question? I actually didn't hear what Mr. Schultz said. 8 9 MR. ST. JOHN: He objected. 10 Madam Court Reporter, can you read back the 11 question? 12 (Court reporter read back the question: 13 "How close are the two standards?") 14 THE WITNESS: So the asylum standard is a 15 well-founded fear of persecution on account of 16 the five factors I listed before. Persecution 17 or well-founded fear of persecution, based upon 18 race, religion, nationality, membership in a 19 particular social group and political opinion. The credible fear standard is a substantial 20 21 likelihood -- it's been a long day. 2.2 apologize -- that an alien could make such a 23 showing. 24 BY MR. ST. JOHN: 25 Q. How close are those two standards in

practice?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- A. In practice, they are pretty close. The asylum standard is not terribly high. The substantial likelihood is akin to -- tracks it, it plainly narrows it, but it doesn't narrow it significantly with respect to -- it's not simply that they make a claim, it's that there's a substantial likelihood that they'll be granted asylum.
- Q. Judge, have you ever thrown a baseball with your son?
- A. I've thrown a baseball, a football, and a lacrosse ball with my son.
- Q. The mechanics of it, you know how to throw a baseball and you expect that when you throw the baseball, you know about where it's going to go, right?

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: That is correct.

I apologize, Counsel. That is correct.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

- Q. Because you've done it hundreds of thousands of times and it's predictable?
 - A. That is correct, Counsel.
- Q. But one of the core ideas of science is that we observe something, we observe it, we observe

it, see the same thing again and again and again. We expect that same result to follow predictably.

Does that agree with your basic understanding of the world?

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: That is human nature, yes,

the way that we have evolved.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

- Q. I suppose the good Lord could shut off gravity and suddenly your baseball is not going to go to your son, but that would be an astounding surprise, right?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And so your analysis here today is that, okay, I think the asylum IFR may not be fully rolled out yet or may even only be rolled out a little, but its ultimate result is predictable.

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

- Q. Correct?
- A. Based upon the statistics that I've seen and based upon the differential with respect to asylum officer grants and immigration grants, I believe that it is predictable.

And with respect to the 21-day rule, the

2.2

2.3

Page 236

completion of that, it would be performed more quickly. I'll note that detain cases are generally contained for about 41 days.

As I told Mr. Schultz before, nondetained cases can go on for an extended period of time, for years before reaching a rule.

Q. I think Mr. Schultz asked you a little bit about fraud, and I think you testified that there was a fraud unit in USCIS.

Am I recalling things correctly?

- A. There is in that -- there is a fraud unit in FDNS that is charged with detecting fraud particularly in applications and with respect to safeguarding the national security of the United States.
- Q. Will the 21-day period, under the asylum IFR, impact the ability of that USCIS unit to detect and resolve fraud?

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: It will have two significant impacts. Because the -- because of the short period of time, there will be no opportunity for -- there will be little opportunity in most cases, in almost any case, for FDNS to actually assess the claim for fraud.

The other way that it would virtually affect it is one of the things that FDNS does is they compare asylum applications, I589s, across different applications, look for similarities, similar language and things like that in sussing out fraud because it waives the I589 requirement.

I have no idea how in the world FDNS is going to be able to assess fraud in that process, and I'm concerned about the effect it would have on national security as well.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

2.2

2.3

Q. Hate to have to walk you through this line of questioning, Judge, but given what transpired today, I feel I need to.

Judge, you made a statement about your math skills. Do you recall that statement?

- A. I do, Counsel.
- Q. And based on your demeanor, quite frankly, I understood that was a joke. Was it a joke, Your Honor?

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: It was a joke, Counsel. I generally check my math more than once to make sure that I didn't make an error.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Q. And you're generally familiar with statistics in the ordinary course of the work you do for CIS; is that correct?

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: I am familiar with statistics. There's a lot of statistics out there, so I'm constantly, as I mentioned before, discovering new sorts -- new data sets that I can use to refine my analysis.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

Q. Judge, it would be misleading, wouldn't it, to take your joke and treat it as anything other than a joke; do you agree with that, Judge?

MR. SCHULTZ: Objection.

THE WITNESS: I do, Counsel. I was -- I was being -- I was joking. Not that I don't have respect for what we're doing today.

BY MR. ST. JOHN:

- Q. Judge Arthur, you work with a lot of folks at the Center For Immigration Studies, or at least several folks; is that correct?
- A. Yeah. We're a pretty small staff, but I believe there are about 20 employees at the Center For Immigration Studies.

2.2

2.3

Page 239

- Q. You don't agree with all of them; is that a fair statement?
- A. We pride ourselves on being nonpartisan.

 And I don't agree with many of the assessments that are made by my colleagues, including the one in question from Mr. North. But we have a policy of if you write it and it's relevant, it gets published.
- Q. Judge, we talked about your experience as an immigration judge.

What did you -- did you have Fridays off -- some Fridays off as an immigration judge?

- A. I had an alternative work schedule, and so I would get every other Friday off.
- Q. Judge, what did you do on those Fridays off?
- A. I would often go to -- I apologize, Counsel, if you want to object.

I would often go to the U.S. CIS office in Baltimore so that I could participate in swearing in new citizens when I was there. A couple of times they were really special things. I'm sure

Mr. Schultz is familiar, but, you know, special events particularly at the Roundhouse, the Baltimore Railroad Roundhouse in Baltimore. But often it would be at the U.S. CIS office, and I was honored to do

Page 240 1 that. 2 MR. ST. JOHN: On that note, unless 3 Mr. Schultz has anything else, I hope we're done 4 for today. 5 MR. SCHULTZ: Thank you. It's 4:45. just have two or three questions. So I think it 6 7 will just take a moment. I'm happy to keep 8 going, but if you need to take a break, of 9 course we can do that. Judge Arthur, I don't think it will be more than two or three minutes, 10 11 but I'm happy to take a break if you'd like. 12 THE WITNESS: No, I'm more concerned about 13 the court reporter. I'm happy to defer to her, but I'm fine otherwise. 14 15 MR. SCHULTZ: That was my next question. 16 Ms. Marsh, how are you? 17 COURT REPORTER: I'm fine. 18 FURTHER EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. SCHULTZ: 20 Q. Okay. So just a couple of questions. 21 Judge Arthur. Did you hear me object to that last question? I was wondering if you heard me object to 2.2 23 that? 24 I apologize, Counsel. I would have stopped 25 if I heard you object.

2.2

2.3

Page 241

Q. No, I don't want to testify. I did not object is what I'm trying to say, but I didn't want to leave the implication that I had. I thought you could answer that. I don't want to testify though.

So two more substantive questions: You said at the University of Virginia that you did not take statistics, correct?

- A. I did not take statistics at the University of Virginia.
- Q. Thank you. Also, is a casual conversation the same thing as an expert report in a case in federal court?
 - A. No, Counsel, it's not.
- Q. Okay. And would you expect that someone writing an expert report would feel -- I'm sorry, let me start that over.

Is it your understanding that someone who writes a federal report should show their work more than someone having a casual conversation with someone?

A. With respect to that, it would be different from filing a legal brief. And certainly as a judge, certainly when I wrote legal briefs, I would cite everything that I said or add a citation for it. But if in doing an expert report, I thought it naturally

Page 242 1 flowed from what I had written, I would not include a 2 citation. 3 But yes, an expert report requires more citation generally than a casual conversation. 4 5 MR. SCHULTZ: Okay. Those are the only questions that I have. So Scott, did you want 6 7 to follow up with anything? MR. ST. JOHN: I do not. 8 9 MR. SCHULTZ: So I have 4:48 p.m., which I think is well within the seven hours, and I 10 11 wanted to thank everyone. Judge Arthur, 12 Ms. Marsh, and Scott, it's been a lot of 13 questions today, but I want to thank everyone 14 for all of your assistance today. 15 MR. ST. JOHN: The witness will read and 16 sign. 17 COURT REPORTER: Okay. And do you both 18 want to order a copy of the transcript? 19 MR. SCHULTZ: Yes, please. 20 MR. ST. JOHN: Yes. 21 (SIGNATURE RESERVED.) 2.2 (DEPOSITION CONCLUDED AT 4:48 P.M.) 23 24 25

	Page 243		
1	WITNESS CERTIFICATION		
2	I, ANDREW ARTHUR, do hereby certify that I have		
3	read and examined the contents of the foregoing testimony as		
4	given by me on December 14, 2023, and that to the best of my		
5	knowledge and belief the foregoing pages are a complete and		
6	accurate record of the testimony given by me, except as		
7	noted on the Errata Sheet attached hereto.		
8	I have have not made changes/corrections.		
9			
10			
	ANDREW ARTHUR		
11			
12	I,, Notary Public for		
13	the County of, State of		
14	, hereby certify that the herein		
15	above-named appeared before me this the day of		
16	, 20; and that I personally		
17	witnessed the execution of this document for the intents and		
18	purposes as herein-above described.		
19			
20	(Official Seal)		
21			
	Notary Public		
22			
	My commission expires:		
23			
24			
25	Job No. CS6327627		

	Page 244
1	ERRATA SHEET
2	DEPOSITION OF: ANDREW ARTHUR
	DATE TAKEN: DECEMBER 14, 2023
3	
	Please read this transcript with care. If you find
4	any corrections or changes you wish made, list them by page
	and line number below. DO NOT WRITE IN THE TRANSCRIPT
5	ITSELF. Return the Errata Sheet and Witness Certification
	to this office. We appreciate your prompt attention to this
6	matter.
7	To assist you in making any corrections, please use
	the form below. If supplemental or additional pages are
8	needed, please furnish same and attach thereto.
9	Page Line Correction or Change/Reason for Change
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	AHM ANDREW ARTHUR
	Job No. CS6327627

Page 245 1 STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA COUNTY OF DAVIDSON 2 3 4 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 5 6 I, APRIL H. MARSH, Notary Public, do hereby certify 7 that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing 8 transcript was duly sworn or affirmed by me prior to the 9 taking of the foregoing proceeding; that said proceeding was taken by me to the best of my ability and transcribed under 10 11 my supervision and direction; that the parties were present 12 as stated; and that I am not of counsel for, related to, in the employment of any of the parties to this action, nor am 13 I financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this 14 action. 15 I do further certify that the foregoing pages 16 17 constitute a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings. 18 19 This the 17th day of December 2023. 20 21 22 April Marsh 23 April H. Marsh 24 Notary Public Number 201119500253 25

Page 246 1 Scott St. John, Esq. 2 stjohn@ag.louisiana.gov 3 December 18, 2023 State Of Arizona Et Al v. Garland, Merrick Et Al 4 RE: 12/14/2023, Andrew Arthur (#6327627) 5 6 The above-referenced transcript is available for 7 review. Within the applicable timeframe, the witness should 8 9 read the testimony to verify its accuracy. If there are 10 any changes, the witness should note those with the 11 reason, on the attached Errata Sheet. 12 The witness should sign the Acknowledgment of 13 Deponent and Errata and return to the deposing attorney. 14 Copies should be sent to all counsel, and to Veritext at 15 erratas-cs@veritext.com 16 17 Return completed errata within 30 days from 18 receipt of testimony. 19 If the witness fails to do so within the time 20 allotted, the transcript may be used as if signed. 21 22 Yours, 23 Veritext Legal Solutions 24 25

[**01130 - 2023**] Page 1

0	12/14/2023	1st 172:14	2016 64:24
01130 1:2	246:5	2	2017 36:15
05 223:14	1225 70:19	2 3:8 20:13,15	89:16 111:19
224:2	128 211:1	20:16 22:2	120:17 219:22
1	129 211:17	71:5 83:19,20	2018 36:15
	12:21 106:6	2,000 26:5,23	182:7
1 3:7 20:7,8,12	12:30 106:10	2,390,584	2019 90:8
21:23 22:1	13 225:5,10	121:25 122:7	120:18 143:20
69:20 70:3	1368 131:13		182:8
71:5 142:18	132:2	2.2. 183:21	202-532-5802
159:23 160:7	14 1:14 243:4	20 3:7,8 36:9	2:14
160:12,17,20	244:2	36:14 66:18	2020 48:12
164:22	14.79 194:16	67:10 86:7	49:11 113:23
10 220:14,15	15 113:4	114:21 146:7	114:25 115:2,3
100 26:13	159 186:5,6	148:10 172:18	115:4,7,9
107:6 180:24	17 141:4,12	172:19,21	116:5,7,9
182:4 198:7,16	143:6	173:23 220:14	2021 66:24
212:15	17th 245:20	220:15 231:19	83:12,19,20
105 201:22	18 143:6,23	238:24 243:16	84:15 86:7
202:14	214:9 215:4,7	2000 114:13	109:10 110:14
106 203:23	215:12 246:3	2000s 120:8	111:8 113:24
204:1	180 153:23	2001 41:10	114:4,7,8,21
10:05 1:15 4:5	154:2,3,5	2003 69:20	115:3,6,14,22
10th 58:5,8	1885 2:4	172:14	119:11 213:15
11 12:25 13:8	18th 216:12	20044 2:13	214:9 215:4,7
42:25 109:10	19 145:22,23	2006 41:11	215:12
110:14	192 3:11	2007 74:17	2022 12:25
11.63 138:3	1941 228:1	2008 69:14	13:8,9 17:24
110 186:4	195 3:13	2009 96:10,21	27:10 115:24
206:10,22	1988 28:9	96:25	135:21,24
207:5	31:12 32:3	201119500253	136:5 141:22
117 211:1	1992 30:9 31:6	245:24	185:12 194:15
11:12 59:9	1994 104:5	2014 74:20	2022/1 50:9
11:13 59:13	1996 40:25	95:13 206:18	2022 /1 30.3 2023 1:14 3:8
11:21 59:16	41:2,5,6	206:20,24	115:25 117:5
11th 114:14	180:20	207:1,4,9	121:24 129:16
12 87:24	1:18 140:7	2015 64:21	132:7 133:12
	1.10 170./	94:22 231:15	133:13 135:22
			133.13 133.22

[**2023 - 74**] Page 2

137:23 143:21	168:24 171:16	3:08 188:13,16	5
194:16 200:20	243 164:22	3:18 188:19	
209:7 243:4	25 192:8	3rd 2:4	5 3:3,12 50:9
244:2 245:20	25,000 129:17	4	96:16 194:24
246:3	26 144:6		195:6,11
2024 129:17	28 205:6	4 3:10 96:16	5-8 113:4
208 57:8 171:3	213:15	192:11,14	50 87:25 88:7
180:15,16	29 206:12	4,015 203:15	90:24 94:2,7
181:19	29 200.12 29th 17:24	41 236:3	227:14,24
208.6 178:6	141:22	42 50:6,24,25	57 186:2
205:15	2nd 83:12	51:5 68:16,20	572 135:24
21 148:14,25		68:21 71:10,12	185:15
149:1,18,19	3	71:21 72:11	58 113:3 205:5
150:19,22	3 3:9 22:12,18	113:23	205:7
150.19,22	23:23 56:19	43 86:1,4,11	589s 182:5
154:2,3,16,21	70:19 164:14	87:20 106:12	5th 82:13 117:5
155:2 156:5	164:15 168:4	45 151:11,13	6
231:3,4,8	168:24 171:16	151:14	6 6:22 12:8
232:12 235:25	184:25	451 69:19	47:1,6 202:8
236:16	30 6:22 12:8	70:11,18,25	219:23 220:7
21137 245:23	47:1,6 89:10	46 106:19	63 205:5,7
2113 7 243.23 212 177:19	89:10 93:7	46,925 147:3	6327627 246:5
212 1/7.19 217 3:4	104:1,3 122:3	46908 144:5	64 116:11
21 7 3.4 22 3:9	202:8 246:17	46909 144:5	65 121:9
223 219:23	30,000 118:2	47 108:4,9	66 119:4 209:1
220:7	30th 84:15,24	192:7 193:24	67 128:7
225-485-2458	31 190:17	48 109:22	134:23
2:5	31st 84:22,25	110:4	69 142:23
2.3 22nd 27:10	325,000 137:22	49 73:7 76:7	143:6
83:18	34 128:15	80:12 81:20	6:22 1:2
23 157:21	34,000 129:17	84:10 87:25	7
235 70:3 71:5,5	36 62:6,21	106:15 186:5,6	-
117:12,13	37 34:25	4:02 217:12,21	7 228:1
142:18 159:23	211:23 212:10	4:45 240:5	70802 2:5
160:7,12,17,20	212:22	4:48 242:9,22	71 143:23
240 3:3	38 180:24	4th 57:2	144:19
240 5.3 241 56:19	182:4		74 145:20,23
164:14 168:4			
104.14 100.4			

[78 - actually] Page 3

78 148:10,17	able 11:6 21:25	access 21:8,9	act 40:25 47:12
231:2	23:13,19 42:19	112:5 117:6	69:11,13 70:4
8	66:21 81:9	221:7	71:17 73:1
8 3:8 131:13	92:5 95:16	accessible	159:15,16
205:15	117:6 124:11	120:14 220:23	172:23 181:20
868 2:13	159:20 237:9	accompanying	219:22 221:10
88 157:21	above 25:17	208:21	acting 87:4
162:23	243:15,18	account 140:9	165:17 209:4,6
89 163:4	246:6	233:15	action 1:2
166:11 232:20	abroad 36:23	accountability	84:19 245:13
8usc 70:19	176:15 177:6	219:25	245:15
9	177:16,25	accounted	actions 108:16
-	178:6	31:17	108:23
92 30:10 31:12	absence 132:1	accounting	activities
154:19,20,22	absent 149:14	29:8 122:13	120:20 162:20
93 135:13,15	absentia	accuracy 246:9	activity 55:5
135:25 136:8	152:24	accurate 9:25	120:22 160:1
185:9 186:1	absentias 153:1	11:19 116:21	160:10
190:12,16	153:5	130:25,25	acts 108:20
94 136:1	absolutely	190:22 207:5,6	actual 12:1
95 179:15,17	79:16 80:5	221:17,18	34:2 58:17,25
180:6,21 181:1	academic	223:24 224:1	70:15 125:15
181:8	32:13,14 90:19	243:6 245:17	125:18 163:8
96 41:1 182:18	93:5,8,9,10,10	accurately 7:13	164:12 170:24
182:23	93:24 105:1,2	113:17 182:15	actually 19:21
9645 51:15	105:9,11,14	200:25	20:23 32:6
9th 57:1 64:24	academics	acknowledge	34:6,21 38:7
67:11 231:21	93:17	145:25	51:12 52:13
a	accept 227:15	acknowledg	54:10,23 55:9
a.m. 1:15 4:5	accepted 73:21	246:12	57:15,24 58:11
ability 131:11	76:8,24 77:6	acquiesces	59:9 63:7
134:15 144:13	77:17,20 78:4	165:16	74:22,25 81:7
184:3 186:18	81:23 88:12	acronym 82:18	83:24 87:6
186:18 205:19	92:12,13,17	127:22 141:18	88:9 89:4,5
230:18 236:17	98:23 99:12	168:12	90:7 101:2
245:10	103:20 218:17	acronyms	106:11 109:4,9
	220:11 227:23	128:2 163:23	110:16,20
	228:17	168:19	115:2 125:3,18

126:10 127:4	addressed	99:22,25 108:6	175:12,14,16
129:19 131:3	41:17 210:17	108:17,21,24	175:22,23
136:21 137:15	addresses	110:3,11	advisement
138:3 149:21	53:15	111:16,18,25	15:21 16:2
151:2 154:17	addressing	112:2,8,18	48:1
156:23 158:2	157:24	114:2,4 121:22	advises 112:7
159:1,1,5,16	adelanto	122:15 123:9	aegis 49:14
160:13 161:1	134:11,13,16	128:9,23 129:6	affect 95:2
168:2 170:1	adjudicate	129:14 130:13	237:2
176:10,18	68:25 171:20	130:22 131:7	affected 90:2
179:17 180:4	223:5	132:3,9 133:3	affirmative
183:15 184:2	adjudicated	134:14,25	170:7,10,11,16
191:14 194:5	54:23,25	135:8 137:15	170:25 172:22
197:16,20	142:19 153:14	217:6,6	173:2,23 174:6
210:10 211:18	176:8	administratio	174:12,20
219:15 220:14	adjudicating	75:11 107:9,21	175:4,11,13,21
221:24,24	178:3	117:25	176:3,10,17
223:13 229:21	adjudication	administratio	affirmed 64:23
230:3 231:11	3:11,13 183:19	83:1,2	245:8
232:12 233:7	193:12	administrative	africa 75:6
236:24	adjudications	12:20	ag.louisiana
adam 82:21	194:5	administrativ	2:6 246:2
adams 226:25	adjudicator	154:10,12	agency 159:2,3
add 17:1 186:5	181:25	199:22 201:19	agents 107:25
241:24	adjuster 31:19	admitted	112:6,11,14
added 17:12	31:21	176:11	ago 6:22 17:12
149:3 164:16	administer	adult 231:18	36:19 61:7,11
197:19	4:12	adults 67:14	71:8 77:25
adding 37:15	administration	231:13,22	85:20 98:6,7
37:16 38:13	38:9 51:3,4	advance 5:3	103:4 127:6
addition 189:1	53:6,11,12	13:10 16:17	138:18 178:10
additional 96:1	62:23 64:2	218:9	196:5
155:22 203:4	66:22 73:10,22	advantage 98:4	agree 4:10,22
211:14 244:7	75:3 76:13,18	adversarial	4:23 5:21 6:5,9
address 34:17	76:24 77:11	166:12,13,18	58:23 59:4
34:18 197:22	80:15 83:3,6	166:19,21,24	61:6 108:13,15
197:25	83:14,21,22	166:25 167:1,7	116:23,25
	84:11 85:9	174:23 175:6	117:4 143:8,14

144:21 230:20	211:10 232:5,7	amis 135:24	9:24 10:12,16
235:3 238:14	232:7,8,8	185:16 199:5	10:20 22:16
239:1,4	allenwood	amnesty 161:9	38:15 44:12,14
agreed 5:2 61:5	56:10	amount 14:15	44:19,25 65:9
61:9	allocated 203:5	14:18 26:1,3	65:18 66:11,13
agreeing 20:14	allotted 246:20	97:18 129:15	66:15 68:7
117:2	allow 96:12	129:19 131:15	72:4,16 73:19
agreement	146:22	132:4,25	79:2,19 86:25
14:23 64:19	allowed 65:14	137:21	94:13 131:16
165:12 231:9	119:23 210:12	analyses 76:1,4	131:21 138:20
232:2,6	allows 145:10	76:12 77:9	139:20 140:4
agrees 5:9	145:12,16	218:25 219:1	152:21 191:14
ahead 58:13	174:11	219:21	193:4,10
135:12 169:3	allude 179:16	analysis 27:5	204:16 214:3
198:15	alluded 75:13	218:4,6,22	223:21 225:16
ahm 244:25	95:12 133:16	226:11 229:21	227:20,22
airport 104:7,9	alpha 82:22	235:14 238:10	233:7 241:4
104:13	alter 146:1	andrew 1:12	answered
akin 234:4	alternative	4:5 5:17 212:1	66:25 68:1
al 1:4,8 246:4,4	239:12	243:2,10 244:2	77:15 123:21
alcohol 28:14	alternatives	244:25 246:5	123:25 138:21
alejandro	189:25	angela 49:17	155:21,23
84:15	amend 156:13	angle 185:7	181:14 208:14
alien 66:23	156:21,24	angles 184:23	answering
69:6,7 152:3	amended	announced	96:23 173:11
159:25 160:8	180:15	82:12 134:13	answers 6:17
164:5 166:6	amendments	137:16	9:21
167:5,5 170:12	156:15 157:1	announcement	anticipation
181:18 207:13	america 75:7	73:12 77:7	139:22
207:22 210:7	99:5 103:5	78:7 84:13	anyway 153:2
233:22	american	85:11 117:5	ao 69:8 163:11
alien's 230:18	39:25 40:1	annual 131:14	166:11 183:25
aliens 63:21	226:8	219:24	aola 21:18
64:2 82:16	americans	annuitant	aos 68:23,24
89:25 116:18	148:5 226:7	27:14	138:6 190:17
121:20 142:16	ami 168:12,13	another's 60:6	apologies
155:16 165:14	168:17 232:13	answer 5:14,16	106:18 140:11
177:20 210:7	232:18	7:5 8:5 9:4,5	158:4

analogiza	annellate 54:17	applied 51.4	annuantiations
apologize 16:19 24:22	appellate 54:17 apples 194:12	applied 51:4 139:2 169:7,10	appropriations 130:18 131:5
25:3 33:6 44:4		169:14,18,20	130.16 131.3
	194:12,17,17	200:21 201:3	
52:20 66:14	196:14,14		approval 58:10
68:5 85:1	applicable	applies 168:2	58:18 59:1
94:24 97:14	231:12 246:8	apply 55:22	april 113:24
98:15 111:7	applicant	138:15 167:24	114:7 115:3,3
114:16 115:1	178:2,7 179:1	168:6 172:1	115:6,7,9
115:15 127:24	179:13 184:2	176:10,17	116:5,7,9
130:16 136:1	applicants	201:3	245:6,23
146:4 152:13	54:22 179:20	applying 68:14	area 16:11
152:22 157:16	198:19	appointed	30:20 45:17
157:20 158:15	application	112:24	59:24 60:3
160:15 168:18	82:12 149:22	appointees	areas 14:20
169:3 170:2,13	150:1 155:7,9	110:25	55:25 59:22
178:21 194:4,7	156:10,13,22	appointment	90:10 120:21
195:2,9 197:2	156:24 170:12	112:24 113:1	227:3
197:16 207:2	170:20,23	appointments	arising 137:25
214:3 216:9	171:22 174:7	117:7	arithmetic
223:5 227:9,19	174:20 177:12	appreciate	186:19
228:23 229:8	178:5,8,11,12	16:3 83:10	arizona 1:4
233:6,22	178:17 179:5	129:3 214:6	12:9 43:19,21
234:19 239:16	179:12,21	244:5	43:22 46:1,14
240:24	180:18,19	apprehended	81:2 246:4
app 117:6	181:23 182:20	74:18	arlington 32:6
appeal 43:23	184:3	apprehends	arrived 125:6
175:1 231:21	applications	75:1	artful 199:10
appeals 173:4	68:11,23,25	apprehension	arthur 1:12 4:5
183:20,20	142:19 155:16	114:9	5:17,21 6:4
appear 20:24	170:25 171:1,8	apprehensions	9:15 15:16
111:10 134:17	171:9 172:4,5	115:12	16:6 21:18
152:8,22	172:11,23,25	approach	22:9,21 23:25
appearances	173:2,24,25	87:23	36:10 44:8,25
2:1	174:12 175:11	approached	59:20 62:12,21
appeared	175:11 176:1,4	13:14,18,24	73:20 80:14
54:11 243:15	176:7 180:4	50:20	86:25 186:12
appears 21:18	181:6 236:13	appropriate	187:14,16
245:7	237:3,4	132:4	192:17 195:16

208:11 212:1	asking 5:4,12	56:23 58:10	175:21,25
218:1 225:16	6:15 8:9 17:6	68:22,25 69:8	176:1,1,3,10
227:8,10	27:15 36:6	71:6,7 73:11	176:17,20
238:20 240:9	68:13 80:6	97:23,24 98:1	177:16,18
240:21 242:11	91:24 139:19	98:1 135:16,24	178:5,8,11,12
243:2,10 244:2	152:18 162:6	137:19,20,22	178:16 179:4,6
244:25 246:5	166:22 200:16	137:24 138:15	179:12,20,22
article 27:9	212:25	140:1 141:10	179:25 180:4,5
49:21,22 51:10	asserted 96:2	141:20 142:19	180:25 181:11
164:15	assess 236:25	143:1,12,15	182:12,13
articles 75:15	237:9	149:8,9,12,13	183:3 184:6
75:17,20,22	assessment	149:21 150:1,5	185:12,19
76:1,4,11 77:9	90:7 181:21	155:7,8 156:10	190:17 191:4
127:15	assessments	156:18,22,24	193:8,18
arts 28:9	239:4	159:24 160:8	194:11,18
asia 75:6	assigns 199:4	163:12 164:1,3	195:22 196:15
aside 17:12	assist 244:7	164:6,8,8,23	196:15 198:19
18:17 24:5	assistance	166:3,4,5	198:21 199:23
28:16 32:11	38:25 39:1	167:1,10,17,18	200:2,5,21
36:24 37:14	42:5,6 46:9,9	167:21 168:7	205:16 211:13
77:2 99:24	242:14	168:15,20,23	221:22,23,25
105:11 153:5	assisted 70:13	169:7,9,10,14	222:8,14,15,23
159:10 173:15	associated	169:15,20	222:23,25
191:18	119:13	170:5,5,6,7,10	223:15 231:5,8
asked 10:17	assume 8:19	170:11,11,12	232:14,23
13:15 14:14,19	34:21 39:17	170:16,17,18	233:2,14 234:3
14:25 32:18	105:3 150:4	170:19,20,23	234:8 235:15
67:25 75:16	186:17 224:14	170:24,25	235:23 236:16
77:14 108:24	assuming 4:13	171:1,7,8,22	237:3
111:3 113:8	60:2	171:22,23	atd 82:17,20
123:21,25	assumption	172:1,1,3,3,4,6	attach 244:8
129:15 132:9	220:15	172:9,10,10,21	attached 34:6
138:18 181:13	astounding	172:22,22,24	243:7 246:11
185:13 188:11	235:11	173:2,6,19,22	attachments
208:13 221:6	asylum 52:1	173:22 174:3,6	62:12
231:2 232:21	54:1,5,24,25	174:11,12,12	attempt 189:24
236:7	55:1,4,14,15	174:19 175:4	attempted
	56:15,15,17,17	175:10,11,13	120:11

attempting	avoid 8:1	40:4 53:19	banking 29:8
120:9	231:24	59:8,16 61:15	banz 48:18
attended 30:7	award 30:23	62:5 80:12	barred 56:14
93:14	aware 7:23	97:8 106:4,10	56:17
attention	12:12,15 29:21	106:12 110:14	bars 176:20
154:18 244:5	32:20 37:6,11	111:6,19,20	baseball 234:9
attorney 1:7	37:12 64:16	112:5 119:11	234:11,14,15
26:7 37:5,5	65:5 71:22,23	120:8 121:8	235:10
57:1,2 104:6	75:17 106:24	129:3 130:10	based 39:25
112:18,21	184:21 199:19	132:16 134:15	55:1,16 75:20
167:2 202:15	221:19	136:13 144:4	76:23 113:15
203:20,22	awareness	149:6 156:1,2	114:9 115:20
204:4,19 205:2	207:3	166:10 168:11	121:23 122:20
224:22 246:13	awful 227:7	169:22 170:3	122:25 137:19
attributed	axelrod 215:22	180:13 181:3	154:13 166:7
205:12	215:24 216:5	185:9 188:19	173:8 178:7
audio 42:18	217:1	191:13 202:4	179:6,11
89:3,4 188:1	b	217:12,21	187:17 189:15
august 43:19		218:1 229:16	191:19 203:5
43:21 44:2,3	b 6:22 12:8	233:10,12	210:21 212:7
64:21 121:24	47:1,6 56:19	background	233:17 235:21
231:15	69:19 70:3,11	27:18 48:8	235:22 237:19
authority	70:18,19,25	51:24 53:16	bases 161:1
92:14 132:13	71:5,5 79:19	backwards	basic 91:2
132:15	81:13 142:18 159:23 160:7	128:20	126:2 186:18
authorization		bad 101:21	235:3
91:7 219:22	160:12,17,20 164:14,22	102:9	basically 20:1
availability	168:4,24	bag 101:8	51:1 53:3
97:2,6,22	171:16 202:8	ball 79:9,15	120:24 143:5
available 50:15	213:8,9,10	139:4,5,13	143:24
124:18 173:7	213.8,9,10	234:12	basing 157:23
181:24 191:21	ba 29:14,16,25	ballpark	basis 104:15
197:13 205:14	bachelor 28:9	222:19 223:2	127:8 131:14
246:6	back 9:15	baltimore 28:2	211:9 220:24
avenues 183:22	13:25 23:25	104:11 239:19	221:1
average 154:11	27:10 29:11	239:23,24	bathroom
averse 179:1	36:19 37:21	bank 31:24	106:3

[baton - border] Page 9

baton 2:5	164:12 168:13	107:21 108:5	182:25 184:23
	172:20 173:8	110:2,11	188:14 198:6
battling 120:7		′	
bavaria 48:19	181:3,5 182:19	111:16 114:4	201:21 210:25
bearing 227:1	183:16 193:12	117:25 121:21	211:16 219:14
bed 63:1	197:19 213:10	122:15,18,19	230:4 236:7
132:10	220:12 221:23	124:9 126:10	blank 192:18
beds 130:1,9	225:20 228:2	127:19 128:8	block 121:12
133:4,15 134:3	228:23 235:24	128:22 129:6	blog 17:4 57:20
134:6 135:7,9	238:24	129:14 130:13	191:7,13,18
began 114:3,19	ben 2:13	130:22 131:7	196:23
143:19	benefit 146:2	132:8 134:14	blue 195:21,24
beginning 1:15	benefits 39:23	134:25	board 42:3
36:16 104:5	41:22 42:11	biden's 83:23	118:20 173:3
115:22	146:21,25	110:16	183:19
begins 206:24	148:6,9 182:14	bifocals 52:21	bolstered 55:4
begun 199:16	226:6	big 186:23	bombed 227:25
behalf 2:2,8	bensman 81:7	226:4	bombing
14:5	best 15:8 16:10	bigger 137:18	229:22
belief 69:16,17	25:13 86:16,23	139:12	book 23:22
243:5	131:18 198:4	biggest 103:1,8	49:21 229:18
believe 15:1,2,3	200:6,12 243:4	binary 78:22	border 50:6
18:6 32:3 36:9	245:10	118:19	74:5,7,18,19
43:17,24 45:18	better 94:3	binder 198:13	74:24 78:8
45:25 47:18	102:8,15	bit 11:23,25	79:4 80:16,17
50:14 61:24	103:10	27:17 33:15	80:21 81:1,8
64:6,8 65:19	beyond 25:17	40:4 41:12	86:8 90:7
66:23 67:13	bia 173:3	42:14,17 51:17	92:12 95:25
68:21 72:9	biden 51:4 53:6	51:18 53:20,23	96:2 97:12
74:13 76:9	62:23 64:2,7	64:15 85:23	101:9,12
81:3 84:2	66:22 73:10,22	93:25 98:15	107:25 108:16
95:23 100:17	75:3,10 76:13	106:11 114:23	110:3,15,16
106:15 107:5	76:17,24 77:6	128:7,20 130:9	111:8,20 112:6
107:19,20	77:11 80:15	134:8 135:12	112:7,11,12,19
109:5 111:22	81:25 83:3,6	135:13 136:13	112:23,25
112:4,7,9	84:1,2,6,11	138:18 140:6,7	114:10 117:10
113:23 114:19	85:9 86:6 87:9	151:21 163:3,5	119:13 120:14
115:11 137:22	89:23,24 95:12	169:23 173:12	120:21 122:14
151:11 159:23	99:21,24	173:13 180:11	122:22 127:20
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	I	

[border - case] Page 10

127:21,21	briefly 35:23	calculation	captioned
129:10 143:1	176:25	121:23 185:25	170:22
143:15 144:15	briefs 241:23	calculations	capture 224:2
160:23 161:7	bring 85:23	125:22 185:22	care 244:3
162:4,7,10,12	91:17 120:25	calendar 152:9	career 110:24
163:2 190:18	122:11 173:20	231:4	carolina 4:14
218:9 219:17	brings 118:2	california	4:16,20 38:10
220:2,13,18,19	broad 74:11	64:22 72:19	140:16 245:1
borders 73:13	brought 146:25	134:12	carries 95:18
77:7 83:6	browser 21:7	call 6:5 34:24	carrying 162:5
84:13 85:11	budget 131:19	39:9 63:7	cartel 120:20
88:15 101:3,4	131:22 132:7	126:20 127:10	120:22
113:16	133:9,12,13	161:15 171:5	cartels 119:5,8
borrowed	budgetary	194:24 215:20	119:9,14,24
89:22	39:19	220:8	120:6,7,18
boss 19:6	budgets 37:25	called 22:5	121:4
bothered 19:10	38:6,20 39:2	48:10,12 50:5	carve 70:1
bottom 128:17	39:16 40:10,18	64:20 82:11,20	carveout 71:3
143:6 145:24	42:7 43:15,18	83:24 98:10	cas 126:6 127:7
205:6	46:10 129:17	118:14 119:15	127:9
bounces 38:10	132:12	159:6 165:22	case 6:21 12:6
box 2:13	build 145:15	170:16 178:11	13:4,7,13,16
boxes 179:5	burden 91:3	178:13 213:5	18:1,4,8 25:22
branch 31:23	bureau's 40:1	228:8	27:1,3,5,16
131:8 132:24	business 15:19	calling 64:13	46:18,19,21,23
159:5,7	47:24	114:17 126:24	47:7,10,13,16
break 6:7 10:9	businesses	calls 65:8,16	47:17,20,23
10:13 25:1,24	148:6	66:8 67:6	54:14 63:19
106:3 127:19	busy 25:4,7	117:22 147:11	64:20 106:24
140:19 169:5	60:23,23	148:24 149:2	106:25 107:1,3
173:13 184:24	button 133:23	175:22	134:16 148:25
240:8,11	c	capacity 1:7	150:5 151:6
breaks 10:4	c 4:1 70:19	63:1 78:15,20	152:3,9,23
140:9	79:19 113:2	79:3,21 165:17	154:11 156:18
breath 152:16	221:6	capital 134:20	165:18 167:2
brief 64:7	calculate	134:21	174:6 176:21
150:11,13	125:15 185:24	caption 47:23	181:7 183:17
241:22			202:9 205:24

[case - children] Page 11

213:20 214:22	124:10,17,17	certify 243:2	charlottesville
216:3,6 225:4	126:14 127:20	243:14 245:6	28:5,8 29:10
236:24 241:11	161:16,16	245:16	31:20 32:7
cases 12:20	162:11,16	cfi 163:15	37:16 92:21
57:5 58:18,25	218:9	167:7,9 169:5	chart 105:19
71:2 134:10	cdu 49:15	cfis 167:19	193:7 196:2,4
137:25 138:5	census 40:1	cfr 205:15	197:8,25 198:3
150:11 152:6,7	center 12:16,18	ch 100:9	198:10 223:25
153:5,20 154:5	19:7 26:20	chad 209:5,6	224:3
183:24 184:5	27:2,7 30:8	chain 112:21	chat 20:22,23
190:18 193:25	39:18 57:11,19	145:7	21:1 187:16
194:11,13	60:14,15 65:4	chairman	chatting
195:23 199:4	125:11 214:15	225:1,2	229:17
200:22 201:3,3	215:2 221:8	challenge	check 26:9
221:25 222:4,8	226:1 238:21	179:9	178:1 179:5
222:14,15,20	238:24	chance 10:1	202:7 237:24
222:23,24,25	center's 216:15	35:15 43:9	checks 85:3
223:6,14 236:2	central 74:21	52:24 60:22	178:6
236:5,24	103:5	chancellor	chewed 189:16
cashed 26:10	certain 43:7	49:16	chided 95:24
castle 48:19	55:3,4,15	change 11:23	chief 74:5
casual 241:10	69:20 71:1,1	13:3 56:1 70:8	75:13 79:4,21
241:19 242:4	120:22 148:24	74:20 83:13	107:2 108:14
cat 165:21,23	182:14 203:5	156:25 157:9	109:9 110:4,13
179:4	219:17	157:10 158:24	110:15,17
catch 107:24	certainly 40:20	160:20 180:9	111:8,12,17,20
152:16	41:21 94:21	184:23 244:9,9	111:25 112:23
categories	96:10 99:12	changed 83:20	112:25 116:20
116:19,19	100:8 104:4,11	changes 11:5,7	116:23,25
catholic 49:14	104:17,21	63:21 243:8	119:11 220:13
caught 119:17	108:19 118:12	244:4 246:10	220:13
caused 90:6	120:11,20	changing 82:25	chief's 112:7
causes 54:8	241:22,23	characteristics	chiefs 112:14
76:19	certificate 31:3	203:6	112:15
caveat 17:1	245:4	charge 119:19	children 40:16
cbp 82:12	certification	119:25 120:24	67:11 69:5,6,7
117:6 118:14	30:19 243:1	charged 236:12	70:2 71:3
118:20 122:21	244:5		146:25 206:16

[children - come] Page 12

207.12.22	220.12.220.5	ala :f 17.00	alagramag 101.0
207:13,22	228:13 229:5	clarify 17:22	closures 101:9
210:7,24	241:24 242:2,4	77:16 129:24	coached 155:16
231:18,23	citations	130:16 169:3	coaching
children's 38:4	182:18	196:25 226:8	154:22 157:5,7
38:18 45:21	cite 72:11 76:2	230:23 231:14	189:1
china 54:25	81:4,15,19	clarifying	coast 140:10,13
chmv 118:1	105:24 219:18	102:17 115:16	140:16
choice 78:22	241:23	198:1 209:10	code 219:23
118:19	cited 75:12	215:21	223:15
choose 73:20	92:15 99:22	class 29:8	codes 223:14
chose 189:13	128:22 193:24	30:22 37:5	cohort 185:19
church 49:14	196:22 227:4	92:23	200:5,20
circle 40:4	cites 76:14	classes 29:5	colleague 81:7
circuit 56:22	citizen 170:13	32:8 93:14	215:1
57:1,2,4,6	citizens 226:9	clean 44:14	colleagues
64:24 67:12	239:20	65:25 155:12	15:22 239:5
174:5 231:21	citizenship	187:14	collect 31:24
231:22	158:20	clear 8:14	219:14,19
circuits 57:3	city 95:13	38:15 42:19	collects 219:16
circulated	226:25	53:2 71:3 92:2	college 27:22
10:23	civil 1:2 2:11	96:20 108:6	27:24 28:1,2
circumstance	100:3 206:1	123:24 127:3	29:23 31:12
135:6	210:10,11	131:22 163:11	32:11 35:21
circumstances	claim 55:20	181:19 189:8	37:1,4,19
149:14	138:1 144:17	214:3 215:9	colloquially
circumvention	168:25 195:23	230:23	61:13
116:1 218:11	234:7 236:25	clearly 7:11,15	column 59:21
cis 12:25 27:12	claims 54:15,23	click 19:25	135:24
40:9,15 42:4	54:24,25 55:4	clinton 112:18	columns 59:23
172:9 190:22	55:12,14,15	close 12:22	151:4,8
209:1 238:4	56:16,17 71:6	15:19 25:15	come 40:19
239:18,25	96:18 97:12	47:23 233:1,13	45:2 46:12
citation 73:3	137:23,24	233:25 234:2	49:9 50:19
73:16,24 74:2	143:1,15	closed 154:10	85:12,13 90:22
76:6 92:18	clarification	154:12 199:22	91:16 95:16
135:3 142:1	176:5	201:17,20	97:11 98:3,17
143:11 147:3,6	clarified	closer 195:20	98:20,21
147:8 181:1	231:20		100:11 104:8

104:22,23	common 88:18	completion	226:7
104.22,23	98:23 179:10	190:19 236:1	conduct 80:13
117:19 119:21	188:4		188:6,7,9,10
122:6 140:2		complicated 26:13	conducted
	commonly 82:9		
147:25 159:21	88:18 92:17	component	135:24
177:3,13,24	220:11	159:4,22	conference
196:3 197:19	communicate	concentration	1:13 4:12
207:10 216:11	24:1,4	28:18,25 29:3	confirm 4:18
221:15	communicated	30:16 92:21	8:21 23:8
comes 23:18	24:8	concentrations	confirmed
85:15 139:22	communicati	29:20	198:20,25
158:16 168:12	138:19	concept 218:16	199:7,7,9
comfortable	communicati	concerned	204:7,11
113:12	111:12 151:1	33:12 176:7	confirming
coming 13:12	communities	181:22 183:11	22:3
26:23 42:15	46:2 80:23,25	237:10 240:12	confrontational
80:20 100:5	community	concerns	167:14
120:12 177:8	40:2	174:13,18	congress 42:25
177:10,11	compare	178:10,16,18	43:3,10,13,22
commenced	103:22,24	178:21,22,24	44:15 45:10,18
115:22	237:3	conclude	45:20 46:8
comment 11:6	compared	160:18	54:12 68:21,23
213:10 215:16	140:15	concluded 71:2	69:24 70:6,8
215:17,20,24	comparing	190:17 242:22	70:14,22 71:19
216:13 217:2	103:2	conclusion	72:4 119:12
comments	comparison	65:17 66:9	124:14 129:15
216:12	101:19 194:13	69:24 76:23	130:18,19
commission	196:14	125:6 192:5	131:14,20,22
243:22	compile 126:10	203:11	132:11,13,18
committee	compiled 126:1	conclusions	132:23 133:7,8
40:20 41:3,10	complaints	60:20 68:9	160:20 161:16
41:19 43:24,25	226:24	condition	168:8 180:15
70:17 71:15	complete 9:20	171:14 193:21	181:19,21
124:13 126:1	243:5	conditions	227:4
220:12 224:24	completed	11:15 55:23	congressional
226:3	201:16 246:17	76:14,15 99:13	35:18 46:3
committees	completely	99:14 100:7	121:19 123:10
227:5	169:1	103:21 148:5	123:11 124:18

124:19,25	consumption	contributed	corporate
125:23 131:16	61:14	136:17	104:22
224:5 227:5	contact 13:13	control 21:17	corporation
conjunction	contain 125:3	119:14 120:11	31:20,23 35:23
42:10	contained 72:7	120:12	correct 6:23
connection	82:14 205:15	controllable	11:1 13:21,22
35:18 38:11,11	236:3	119:15 120:16	16:22,23 18:6
76:22 84:7	contains	controlling	19:20 25:19
208:18	177:19	120:23	26:25 27:13
consensus	contents 243:3	convened	28:6 29:14,17
116:15 118:6	context 72:23	36:15	30:11 31:6,7
consider	88:22 170:6	convenient	35:9 41:2 43:2
118:24 171:9	173:23 174:20	33:22	45:11 48:13,14
consideration	174:21,22	convention	51:22 52:2,11
149:22	175:7 183:17	52:5 56:19,20	52:19,20 57:22
considered	202:12	164:16 165:9	61:12 62:2
171:8	continuances	165:11,21,24	63:4 64:14
considers	150:12	167:22 168:4	65:6 67:24
178:4	continue 67:13	168:25 171:6	68:4 69:3,11
consistent	146:11	171:12,16,17	71:13 73:15
113:14 216:18	continues	conversation	74:14 76:7
constantly 17:3	79:16 80:4	229:11,20	78:12,23 79:19
197:3 238:8	138:13	230:12 241:10	81:6 82:2,4
constitute	contours 27:20	241:19 242:4	83:17 84:4
245:17	contraband	convicted	85:20,21 86:12
constitution	119:17	56:14	92:25 96:21
201:24 204:12	contract 14:5,8	copies 246:14	102:21 105:24
204:18	14:10,12 15:5	copy 15:13,16	106:21,22
constitutional	16:14 213:19	15:17,18 16:9	110:7 113:18
30:22	214:8	32:24 33:20,21	115:17 116:22
consulate	contractor	62:9 192:10	121:14,15
177:16	26:11	212:4 213:12	122:5 123:16
consult 110:3,5	contractual	242:18	128:18 130:1,2
110:19 111:5	14:22	core 62:13,15	130:12 131:23
111:14 155:11	contrary 76:21	212:12,18	132:21,22
156:12	167:3,4	234:24	135:22 136:12
consultation	contrast	corners 166:2	137:6 139:3,5
111:24	166:13		139:6 140:12

[correct - countries]

	1		1
143:7,11 144:7	73:14 86:11	94:18 95:22	192:9,18 193:2
145:18 150:2,3	88:4 91:9	96:22 97:1	193:21 194:2
150:21,24	122:1 128:13	104:18 105:21	195:17,25
153:4 158:1	133:19 208:2	106:22 108:10	196:8,12,17
161:12,19,21	236:10	108:12 113:6	198:23 199:15
165:25 169:7	corresponden	115:1 116:14	199:25 200:24
169:21 170:21	4:25	116:22 118:9	201:1,9,13
171:24 172:17	corruption	121:15 122:2,5	202:3,10 203:9
175:8,12,16,17	99:16,16,19	123:17 128:12	204:23 205:3,9
175:19 183:5,9	cost 46:1 91:3	128:14 130:12	206:25 207:19
183:17 185:17	147:1,24 148:1	130:16 135:22	208:1,3,16
190:24 191:10	207:13,22	136:7,9,12	209:2,23 210:3
192:3 193:2	226:21 227:1	139:3,6 141:6	211:4,7,24
199:15,24,25	costs 207:23	141:8 143:4,7	212:3 213:7,17
201:9 202:3,10	209:25 211:14	144:2,20	214:21 215:13
205:9,22	counsel 2:1 4:7	145:18 146:13	217:10 218:19
206:25 207:19	4:21 6:3 7:6,16	146:16 147:5,9	220:4 224:22
209:2 211:24	8:10,17,23 9:8	148:11,19,22	226:2 227:13
212:3 213:17	9:22 10:3,6,10	149:19,23	227:19 229:9
219:4,17,18	10:15 11:4,9	150:21,24	229:21 230:9
220:3,4,6,20	11:13,21 13:2	153:4,8 154:3	230:15 231:7
223:10,12	13:20 14:23	154:24 155:11	233:5 234:19
225:24,25	16:17,18 17:9	156:12,25	234:23 237:18
226:15,17	22:11 23:10	157:8,22	237:23 238:16
229:5,6,9	24:23 33:5,18	158:18 160:25	239:17 240:24
230:1,13,15	41:18 49:8	161:21 163:1	241:13 245:12
232:19,25	52:2,7,20	163:13 166:16	246:14
234:18,19,23	53:16 58:22	166:21 167:8	counsel's
235:13,20	63:4 65:7,10	169:21 172:17	104:14
238:4,22 241:7	68:4,19 69:3	172:19 175:8	counselor
correction	70:20 71:14	175:17 181:9	97:14 98:8,12
189:2 244:9	73:15 78:5,22	182:16,24	176:12,14
correctional	79:6,10,14	183:5,9 185:17	177:1,4,25
56:9,10	80:9 81:21	186:3,22	178:6,14
corrections	82:2,4 85:21	187:15,18,21	countries 54:22
243:8 244:4,7	87:17,21 88:3	187:24 188:11	55:5,18,19,24
correctly 26:14	88:5 90:19	190:24 191:6	74:15,21 75:5
63:3 69:2	91:10 92:11	191:10 192:1,3	75:6,7 98:20

[countries - cumulative]

100:6,8,13	57:4 95:14	covered 135:10	credit 31:20,23
101:4,7,24	131:25 132:4	covers 53:3	35:22 37:16
102:7,14	142:20 152:8	covid 100:24	39:7,10,14
103:22,25	179:9 217:15	100:25 101:2,5	40:8,14 42:3
165:7,14,14	238:3 240:9	134:3,5,7	crime 99:15
country 55:6,9	court 1:1 2:12	create 59:6	crimes 56:14
55:22,23 56:2	4:9,10,14,19	77:19 119:15	criminal
56:2 63:8	7:12,22 8:6	120:15 140:1	177:23 232:5,6
91:18 95:8,18	9:13 10:25	161:25	232:7,8,9
98:21 99:13,14	42:21 47:8	created 24:1	crisis 129:9
99:15 100:5,20	56:5,6,7,22	105:25 125:12	criteria 114:5
101:18,22	64:20,22 65:3	159:2,7 172:16	177:17,18
102:8 145:14	79:17 80:5	creates 141:21	critical 218:9
149:14 165:3,4	122:18 137:25	145:2	criticisms
165:7 177:9,12	138:14 149:20	creation	174:10
178:1 230:24	150:5,10 151:6	228:25	criticize 158:8
country's	151:16,23,24	credibility	criticized
103:21	153:24,25	179:11 181:21	162:24
county 243:13	155:1,14,17,25	181:22	cross 119:23
245:2	156:2,4,11	credible 63:12	167:4 174:25
couple 18:13	174:5 175:6	63:12,22 66:18	crossings
19:22 20:2	180:2,2 183:18	70:2 96:9,12	144:15
34:3 48:5	183:20,25	96:17,18 97:12	crosstalk 7:20
59:19 88:7	184:7 185:4	138:1 139:25	44:12 68:3,7
95:5 103:3	187:8 189:8	142:17 148:15	186:11
121:11,11	190:5 193:25	155:6 160:9	crystal 139:4,5
143:22,24	205:24 231:15	163:5,15,17	139:12
145:9 152:20	231:21 233:10	164:1,2,7,12	cs 246:15
185:10 186:14	233:12 240:13	166:11 167:10	cs6327627 1:25
188:22,23	240:17 241:12	167:13,24	243:25 244:25
201:22 202:4	242:17	168:10,11,21	csu 49:15
208:5 222:8,17	court's 64:7	169:6,18 178:4	cuban 118:3
223:4 239:20	courts 67:3	180:3 193:20	cumbersome
240:20	151:18,19,22	194:1,5,14	195:13,14
course 12:17	166:25	195:23 205:16	197:11,17,22
30:25 39:18,21	cover 45:17	232:22 233:2	197:24
43:6 45:2	97:17	233:20	cumulative
46:13 47:3			182:19 210:21

current 47:7	data 118:15	150:23 151:11	196:15
184:16,17	121:23 123:1,3	151:13,13,14	decline 89:16
188:10 212:4,7	125:18 136:16	151:14 153:23	89:17 90:6
currently 5:12	137:10 185:23	154:2,2,3,3,5	115:25,25
6:11 38:8	193:7,8 196:2	154:17 155:2	decrease 88:13
100:9	196:4 197:3	156:5 231:19	decreased
custody 109:2	221:9,12,12,16	236:3 246:17	89:13 94:9
118:14,16	221:20 222:6,7	dc 57:4	decreases 96:5
122:20 124:10	222:7 223:8,19	de 140:5	deep 113:22
152:3	223:24 224:2	deal 57:3	defendant's
customs 162:4	238:9	104:15 179:18	21:20
162:17	date 12:21	deals 53:15	defendants 1:9
cut 7:21 63:14	13:23 14:7	dealt 90:20	2:8
123:22 129:15	44:1,4 114:16	231:3	defense 219:22
131:9 132:9	114:17 142:3	debate 132:6	defensive
160:2	215:6 244:2	decades 90:20	170:18,20,25
cutting 128:10	dated 213:15	100:2	172:4,24
129:1,2 130:10	215:4,12	december 1:14	173:25 174:21
130:14,17,24	dates 114:23	3:8 66:24	174:22
131:4 135:5	115:14 214:7	96:10 115:24	defer 240:13
cv 1:2 34:14	david 57:14,15	120:18 228:1	deferral 171:17
35:5 44:3	57:15,18 58:13	243:4 244:2	define 102:12
213:5	82:22	245:20 246:3	221:18
d	davidson 245:2	decide 151:6	defined 165:18
d 4:1 62:1	day 20:14	153:10	206:15,16
81:14,14	66:18 67:10	decided 76:6	220:5,7 226:9
134:19 158:3,3	76:1,1,4,5	92:15	definitely
231:17	77:10 86:7	decision 66:23	133:6 160:19
d.c. 2:13 30:8	111:21 148:25	67:12 108:19	definition 39:6
32:5 140:16	154:21 231:3,4	109:6 122:18	69:8 164:17
daily 17:4	231:8 232:12	144:14 173:5,6	166:4 176:23
103:2 135:6	233:21 235:25	195:22 232:1	definitive 15:9
220:24,25	236:16 243:15	decisions 58:17	223:21
dana 232:3	245:20	58:25 109:12	degree 29:9,13
dangers 109:11	days 148:14	172:10 173:22	29:13 32:11,12
dashes 197:24	149:1,18,19	174:3,19 175:1	45:19 67:16
	150:14,17,18	175:10 193:8	90:17 92:23
	150:19,20,22	194:18,18	108:14 159:4

7 0001	2101120		10101-10
degrees 29:24	210:11 218:5	deputy 2:3	134:3,6,7,12
31:9 32:13,14	218:15,20	derivative	135:7,9 153:2
93:8,9 99:6	220:24	221:12	162:21 232:5
102:14	dependent 55:5	descent 77:10	determination
delay 144:24	55:9	described	66:19 96:9
145:1,6,10,16	depending 89:7	179:24 243:18	148:16 168:7
148:14,21	91:13 99:6	description 3:6	180:3
154:21,21	depends 56:4	designated	determinations
155:3,8,10	101:11,11	71:1	60:21 63:12,13
156:6,9 157:20	180:12	despite 63:1	63:22 142:17
delegated	deponent	detail 126:5	172:22 174:11
69:19	246:13	detain 66:17,23	179:11
deliberations	deposed 5:9	67:14 236:2	determine
131:25	6:21,21 46:22	detained 56:5,7	164:4 176:19
demand 91:3	46:23 47:1	91:15 118:18	177:23
demeanor	deposing	150:10 151:6	determined
237:19	246:13	151:16 152:7	69:25
demographer	deposition 1:12	153:1,7,24	deterrence
90:11	3:7 4:8,22 5:1	154:4 184:13	108:6 109:16
demography	5:22 6:6 7:12	231:23 232:11	109:18
90:10,13,18	9:24 10:5,22	232:17	detriments
demonstration	11:11 12:8	detaining	148:7
55:19	16:16,18,25	64:17 65:6,15	dhs 62:23 87:5
denial 183:15	17:8,14,17	82:10,15	90:7 109:16
183:16,22	18:9,19,23	detect 236:17	124:9 126:14
184:9	19:1,3,5,10,12	detecting	127:4 128:16
denials 183:14	19:17 20:7,15	236:12	129:16 131:13
183:14 199:21	21:14,20 22:4	detection 159:6	131:20 138:13
denied 21:8,9	22:5 25:25	detention 63:1	159:2 161:9
183:25 201:18	33:13 47:6,7	63:23,25 64:3	185:20 218:24
deny 186:6	75:14 78:11,13	64:4,12 65:1,4	dianne 72:19
department	85:14 187:1	65:13 66:2,5	died 24:24 25:3
2:4,11 35:24	188:1 189:3,12	66:21 67:2	difference
36:5 52:18	189:22 190:6,7	91:4 94:8 95:1	140:12 155:4,5
172:15 177:6	190:9 242:22	96:5 117:14	156:7 179:17
177:15 191:20	244:2	129:20,25	differences
202:19 204:8	depositions	130:9 131:12	60:20
204:11 206:2	7:19	132:9 133:4,15	

different 49:24	160:13,22	dispositively	195:18,21
54:22 59:5	161:9 162:24	71:25	196:6,10,14,19
82:16 103:17	224:23	dispute 35:24	196:20,22
104:12,24,25	directs 160:7	disputes 36:4	197:7,20
105:13 106:17	disagree 60:17	36:22	200:17 201:15
115:14 121:5	76:10 187:15	distinct 115:19	212:23 213:2
123:1 145:9	187:16 190:9	173:9	243:17
169:19 170:24	disagreed	distinction	documented
172:24 174:9	60:13,25 61:7	199:6	75:10
179:18,24	disclosure	distinguish	documents
183:11 185:7	205:17	114:6	17:16,18,21,25
190:14 232:23	disclosures	distinguishing	18:3,4 20:2
237:4 241:21	124:8,9 125:11	105:13 158:8	40:2 88:15
differential	126:9 127:18	district 1:1,1	117:20,21
103:4,6 138:3	221:14	2:12 64:22	122:15 124:5,6
235:22	disconnect	231:15	125:8,14
differentiate	115:6	disturbed 6:12	126:13 157:14
70:14 103:16	discovering	divide 186:6	157:15 173:7
differently	238:9	division 1:2	197:12,18,18
158:10	discovery 18:5	2:11 206:1	doe 205:23
differing 58:10	discuss 52:8	210:10,11	210:9,11,23
77:19 99:6	71:17 136:17	docket 151:24	doing 9:12 46:5
102:14	discussed	152:2 153:1,12	59:9 102:9,10
difficult 7:20	39:14 40:7,13	153:20 154:5	125:18,20
207:23 209:25	42:1 51:12	154:14	238:18 241:25
210:16,18	discusses	dockets 152:6,7	doj 137:23,25
dilly 65:2,20	110:20 174:6	153:6,7 154:7	181:4 206:1,1
dipped 152:13	discussing	document 15:8	210:10 231:21
direction 194:8	51:25 232:20	15:9,12 16:9	dolly 64:22
245:11	discussion	51:6 59:3 85:6	231:16
directive 96:11	14:17 71:25	87:2,11 128:21	donald 89:15
directly 32:4	72:21 73:1	147:11 158:11	161:17
55:20 72:4	132:5 227:11	178:25 179:8	door 157:4,6
84:6 90:1	discussions	181:4,4,17	doubt 173:24
185:22 196:23	133:7	192:25 193:13	207:21 209:18
director 19:7	disorder 99:15	193:23 194:4	209:19,21
96:11 104:19	displayed	194:10,22	210:4,19
157:25 158:5	20:18	195:5,9,12,15	230:22

enrolled	erratas 246:15	exact 15:6 85:4	51:13 69:22
207:16	error 237:25	191:14	83:15 86:8,14
enrollment	errors 11:2	exactly 203:13	87:12 131:8
206:15,15	221:20	216:21 230:12	132:12,24
207:14	escapes 87:5	examination	133:9 153:18
enter 14:4	esq 2:3,9,9,10	3:1 5:19	191:20
82:11 96:1	2:10 246:1	174:25 217:24	exhaustively
107:10 109:20	establishes	240:18	45:19
117:16,18,20	166:6 207:12	examine	exhibit 3:7,8,9
119:25 144:16	estimate	103:21 104:5	3:10,12 20:7,8
176:13,16	131:17 222:19	167:4	20:12,13,15,16
177:21 232:10	estimated	examined	21:23 22:1,2
entered 89:25	121:20	243:3	22:12,18 23:23
231:19	estimates 220:8	example 92:1	32:23 34:4,10
entering 74:18	et 1:4,8 246:4,4	examples 94:17	35:1,11,20
89:19 120:19	europe 75:6	118:13	37:2,15 39:7
entire 8:20	evan 2:9 4:7	except 6:8 57:4	39:10,14 40:8
23:20 73:8	events 29:6	92:22 138:13	40:14 42:2
159:3,15	239:23	147:21 155:11	157:17 192:11
entirely 12:14	eventually	156:9 164:11	192:14 194:24
13:9 174:3	199:21	165:20 172:6	195:6,11 213:3
entry 74:14	everybody	243:6	213:8,9,10
117:7,19 232:9	60:15	exception 70:1	214:12
eo 83:11,15	evidence 15:8	exceptions	exhibits 3:5
eoir 37:6,8	33:14 69:16	232:11	19:22 23:19
142:25 145:24	86:16,23	exchange	34:3,6
146:8 181:4	112:10 123:12	187:19	exist 76:6
eoir's 197:11	147:16,18	exchanged	105:7 216:16
equal 102:7	159:11 167:3,4	18:5	existence 50:25
equally 117:13	181:6,10	exclude 70:2	207:10
equities 145:15	200:12	excluded	existing 62:24
eric 226:24	evidences	116:18	63:9
erin 2:9	162:7	executed	exists 228:10
erin.t.ryan	evolved 51:3	139:10	expand 201:3
2:14	235:7	execution	expanding
errata 243:7	exacerbated	243:17	63:10 196:21
244:1,5 246:11	129:14	executive 3:10	196:25
246:13,17		3:12 19:6	

• :	14004754	T • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	70.00 .00.15
expansion 75:4	14:20 15:24	explain 54:16	73:23 80:16
97:10 137:14	19:18 22:13	169:4 197:4	95:11,22 98:2
expect 234:14	23:2,7,15,24	207:9	109:4 132:7,8
235:2 241:14	24:1,9,12	explained 51:2	134:12,14
expedited	25:14 26:1	123:6 142:25	138:9,13
96:17 164:5	32:25 34:3,25	explaining	155:16 156:10
expediting	40:7,13 42:2	95:15 97:2	159:23 175:22
107:9 211:12	42:24 46:17,20	137:2	178:16 179:10
expenditures	46:23 47:8,9	explains 50:24	180:16 184:11
37:24 38:24	48:9 62:9,10	208:9,23	199:1 207:12
39:2,15 40:10	72:12 78:14,19	explanation	207:15,16
42:4,6 43:14	81:5,16 103:14	58:9	210:8 218:10
43:17 45:22	105:6,23	exploit 159:21	218:13 219:20
46:10 201:11	106:23,25	extended 63:22	220:11,23
experience	107:1,5 123:4	232:4 236:5	224:3,15
32:18,22 34:11	123:19 124:7	extensions	228:13 232:1
34:15,19 35:20	124:21 135:4	150:6 154:8,13	factor 76:25
37:18 39:5	182:21 196:20	extra 53:12	77:2,19,21
42:1 51:20	197:8 213:19	eyes 84:1	78:7 98:6,10
53:19,25 66:20	214:1 216:2,5	eyesight 195:19	98:11,14,14
93:7,13,22,23	224:8,15 225:4	\mathbf{f}	99:7,8 100:16
93:24 95:1	225:6,11	f 47:12 165:20	100:19 101:1,3
97:8 99:23	226:13 231:3	face 96:7 162:1	101:9,17,19,21
101:25 104:1,3	232:21 241:11	162:2,3,8	102:1,3,4,7,12
104:23 120:3	241:15,25	facially 146:9	102:16 103:9
149:9 152:5	242:3	146:17 147:6	103:11 109:17
167:15 224:21	expertise 14:21	147:11,14,15	109:19,19
225:19 239:8	14:25 16:11	147:16,18	138:10,19
experiences	51:20 59:25	148:2	139:8,14 140:2
39:13 40:6,12	60:3 67:20,22	facilitate 145:5	140:3 144:25
experiential	118:25	145:6	145:3 220:10
105:17	experts 73:23	facilitates	230:19
experiment	77:18 116:16	145:1	factors 58:17
206:14	118:6,11,21,23	facility 134:12	58:24 59:5
experimental	218:18 226:18	facing 139:25	61:9 85:19
103:19	226:20	fact 25:5 54:10	87:23 98:16,16
expert 3:9	expires 243:22	64:4 65:2	98:19,19,22,23
13:15 14:14,16		0 05.2	98:25 99:2,2,4

[factors - first] Page 23

99:10,12,24	familiarized	233:15,17,20	137:23 156:11
100:2 101:15	211:3	february 83:11	170:12
	families 39:1		
102:19,20,22		83:18,19,20	filing 195:22
102:24 103:17	64:17 65:6,15	114:4,8,19	215:17 241:22
104:25 105:14	66:17,23	115:22 218:12	final 141:20
136:14 218:4	family 42:6	federal 56:8,10	149:4 155:6
218:17,21	46:10 65:1,3,4	57:6 66:16	168:7,16
233:16	66:5,21 67:14	147:11 148:18	169:14,24
facts 55:22	82:11 103:9	149:8,9,12	170:1,2 171:18
68:11 204:8	231:12,19,22	162:14 219:16	172:10 193:19
fail 152:8	231:25 232:17	221:11,13	196:16 199:24
failed 152:22	famine 100:15	223:9,12,20,23	200:2,5
fails 246:19	famous 229:1	241:12,18	financially
failure 110:5	far 161:15	fee 26:3,4,23	245:14
110:18 111:5	180:8 200:3	feedback 42:14	find 11:2 20:4
111:14	222:3	feel 141:1	74:2 106:18
fair 68:15 94:1	farra 165:20	237:15 241:15	145:20 151:4
94:5,7 101:23	fathers 132:17	feeling 147:13	174:5 193:4
115:9 116:4	fdns 236:12,24	fees 120:24	244:3
139:2 148:23	237:2,8	feinstein 72:18	finding 159:25
153:9 158:7,7	fear 63:12,13	72:19	160:9 166:13
158:9,13	63:22 66:18	fellow 12:16	197:3
169:17 170:20	70:2 96:9,12	27:8	fine 17:5 42:22
191:2 194:9,12	96:18 97:12	fewer 163:23	49:1 62:14
197:6 224:15	138:1 139:25	field 89:9 93:20	126:23 133:5
224:19 239:2	142:17 148:15	118:16,24	140:18 185:4
fairly 22:14	155:6 160:9	122:23 127:25	200:11 215:20
33:22 34:16	163:5,15,17	147:12 225:11	217:15 240:14
98:23 115:23	164:1,2,7,13	figure 21:4	240:17
fall 36:9,13	166:7,11	192:4	finish 8:5,9
false 190:2	167:10,13,24	figuring 6:8	186:12
familiar 6:24	168:11,21	file 149:13	finished 126:15
35:17 98:9	169:6,18	150:1 155:8	firm 41:15
105:8 149:8	175:24 178:4	179:20 180:4	first 6:20 10:8
153:17 219:9	180:3 193:20	180:24 182:4	12:12,14 20:6
219:10 221:3	194:1,6,14	filed 12:23	23:14 28:2
228:8,10 238:2	195:23 205:16	24:10 56:17	34:4 35:7,14
238:6 239:22	232:22 233:2	68:23,25	50:12 90:23
		, -	

[first - fourths] Page 24

92:8 110:16	94:10 95:2,4	following	40:9,15 42:3
114:6 128:19	100:21,23	82:16 86:9	48:15,17 55:5
134:23,24	103:24 105:19	91:7 116:1	95:18
142:14,23	117:9 119:14	161:8,14	foreshadowing
145:10 146:8	120:2 218:8	173:12 180:3	89:3
149:7,24	220:18,18	208:6,7,12	forgive 170:14
161:12 185:9	flowcharts	follows 5:18	220:1
185:13 187:9	105:25	91:2 206:7,7,7	form 42:8
188:22,23	flowed 242:1	font 53:5	73:20 164:11
189:23 196:4	flows 88:1	food 100:17	166:5 215:16
198:18 200:19	90:10,25	102:1 140:25	244:7
202:11 206:13	102:20 104:2,5	foot 149:13	former 69:21
208:5 216:22	104:12 135:6	football 234:11	69:22 83:21,22
225:9	136:18 218:7	footnote 76:7	100:10 164:22
fiscal 133:20	fluctuation	92:10,18	209:4,8,9
five 59:11	116:3	118:10 122:3	215:1
106:4,7 160:3	fluent 81:9	128:15,15,20	formula 105:19
188:15 217:16	fmap 203:16	128:21,22,25	forth 112:5
217:22 223:3	fmu 232:17	181:2 190:21	171:3 184:10
233:16	fmus 82:11	192:7 193:9,11	forward 41:24
fix 94:6	232:13	193:24 208:7	135:13 137:17
flip 34:4 163:6	focus 107:9	208:11,15,21	149:1 190:10
flipping 33:23	111:2 154:17	208:24 209:12	193:17 210:25
flores 64:20	focussing 136:4	227:15 228:2,5	211:16
65:4 67:12	foia 47:10,12	228:13,17	foundation
231:9,16	221:10,14	footnotes	47:19 136:14
florida 64:19	folks 42:16	182:18 205:5	founded 166:7
74:5 76:16	61:19 69:5	227:8,11	233:15,17
108:3 109:5,13	90:9 140:24	footprint	founding
109:14 198:20	153:2 185:3	176:18	132:17
201:14 203:24	238:20,22	force 103:17	four 52:3 54:11
203:25 204:12	follow 10:1	105:13 139:14	55:10 89:18
204:17,21	33:16 48:2	forced 189:19	96:15 136:10
207:22 214:19	59:19 132:11	foregoing	137:9 199:21
flow 88:10,11	134:2 193:6	243:3,5 245:7	206:23
88:12,13 89:12	235:2 242:7	245:9,16	fourth 182:7
89:23 90:3,6	followed 83:1	foreign 35:24	fourths 141:10
90:21 92:7	197:1 214:2	36:4,22 39:8	

[fox - given] Page 25

fox 120:8	fund 201:24	gander 16:1	222:15 223:18
frame 191:12	funding 128:10	gaps 119:15	223:19 225:12
202:23 207:4	129:1,2,16,25	120:16	226:20 227:23
framed 215:18	130:11,14,18	garland 1:7	228:17 231:24
francisco 104:6	130:19,24	12:10 246:4	236:2 237:24
104:7,10	131:5,9,12,15	gears 11:23	238:2 242:4
franklin 2:13	132:25 135:5	224:7	generated
frankly 237:19	161:16 162:7	gee 64:22 94:21	10:25
fraud 154:22	203:5,15	231:16	geopolitical
155:3,14 156:6	funny 138:17	general 1:7 2:3	76:14
156:9 157:4,7	furnish 244:8	52:1 82:15	george 30:7
159:6,9,18	further 62:25	102:25 104:13	32:5 37:23
236:8,9,11,12	64:16 128:7	112:19,21	38:3,17,23
236:18,25	146:24 183:18	205:2	german 50:1,2
237:6,9	203:4 240:18	general's 26:8	51:8 61:15,19
free 60:15	245:16	37:5 202:15	229:23
freedom 47:12	future 180:9,11	203:20,22	getting 21:8
221:10	fy 74:17,20	204:4,19	38:8 42:14
friday 239:13	129:16,16,16	generally 12:3	123:9 130:20
fridays 239:10	133:12,13,20	41:17 42:12	136:24 138:16
239:11,14	137:23 182:7,8	45:16 59:24	150:2 177:5
front 14:9	g	60:5 73:21	195:20 210:16
21:25 22:16	g 4:1 62:1	74:1,3 75:24	212:21
32:25 62:10,17	231:17	76:8,24 77:5	give 7:2 9:20
110:22 113:11	gain 91:5 92:6	77:17,20 78:4	10:1 30:22
156:18 211:22	gained 93:22	81:23 88:12	39:5 46:3 59:7
212:5,24 213:2	galbraith	91:1 92:9,12	85:22 94:17
213:13	229:19,22	92:13 98:23,24	106:1,17
frozen 89:1,5	230:7	99:12 100:12	112:15 118:12
full 11:19	game 43:11	103:20 117:25	126:25 127:2,4
21:25 52:24	44:18 68:15	125:7,16	127:9 150:6
68:9 122:13	116:20 117:3,4	150:14 153:6	154:7,12
146:8 155:24	117:23	155:14 163:8	155:10 191:14
163:19	games 187:3,6	163:16,17	196:14 202:5
fully 72:16	187:10 189:10	174:14,17	given 9:16
90:5 235:15	189:18,20	202:11 217:4	11:10 65:14,22
functions 52:18	107.10,20	218:17 220:10	65:23 66:5
162:6		221:16,18	109:15 139:12

[given - grant] Page 26

139:13 154:15	234:15 235:10	136:13 137:16	gotaways
171:25 184:11	236:5 239:16	138:6,24 139:8	220:5,9,16
188:6,7 203:10	239:18	140:7,20,22	gotten 95:7
203:11 210:17	goal 20:1	142:4,23	government
237:14 243:4,6	153:18,21,23	145:20 146:20	27:14 36:9
giving 11:19	goes 34:11,12	148:4 149:5	65:13 66:17
12:7 79:23	51:20 52:9,13	160:12,14,17	67:3,4,4
92:1 104:24	128:16 143:3	163:7 166:20	101:11 104:21
glowing 84:1	180:1 201:25	174:5 176:8,22	120:5,9 131:10
go 6:3,24 13:25	204:1 213:3	181:11 184:22	157:8 162:10
21:7 27:22,24	219:20,21	185:1,2,7	162:15,25
30:3,6 32:5	going 5:5,15	186:24,24	165:16 167:2
34:23 36:19	6:15,16 8:7,19	187:2,2,6,22	219:4,16,24
37:21 51:23,24	10:12,24 11:23	187:23 188:6	221:11,13
53:19 59:8	11:25 14:16	188:14 189:4,5	223:9,13,20,23
61:9 64:15	16:21 19:21,23	192:11,12	224:24
73:6,7 80:16	19:25 20:6,12	193:3,4 194:22	governments
81:7 98:22	20:13 21:22	194:24,24	45:23 101:10
106:19,19	22:1,2,12,15	202:6 207:20	146:10
109:22 112:12	23:23 24:24	217:8,19 219:8	grade 30:21
113:3 116:10	25:6,9 33:7,9	223:2 224:7	gradual 138:12
118:6 121:8	33:14 34:23,25	230:25 234:15	gradually
125:5,14 126:8	35:2,3 38:14	235:10 237:9	137:17 140:4
126:9 127:18	39:7,9 47:22	240:8	graduate 27:25
130:10 134:15	48:6 52:4 62:6	good 6:3 15:25	28:7
135:19 137:24	62:15 67:1	16:1 33:4,18	graduated
138:14 148:25	68:17 71:4	39:12 49:5	29:23,25 30:10
149:21 163:10	73:8 83:13	53:1 54:16	31:5,8,11,12
169:3 177:15	85:22 86:3,20	66:14 80:10	35:21 37:4
180:13 182:9	87:25 88:8	101:22 102:10	graduating
183:18,24	90:15 92:4	142:7 185:6	37:1,19
185:9 188:14	95:17 106:3	195:11,19	grande 81:2
190:10 191:13	111:1 113:4,13	211:20 232:21	grant 54:1,5,9
192:16 193:16	113:25 121:16	235:9	54:18 55:1
198:15 200:18	123:23 127:5	goose 16:1	56:23 59:6
201:21 202:12	127:10 128:20	gorbachev's	150:11 170:6
203:3 210:25	129:3 130:9	28:14	174:8 179:22
217:9 228:7	132:16 133:6		179:25 180:9

181:12,17	1.	heading 194:8	helps 10:17
182:11 183:1,2	h	202:6	128:3
183:23 221:23	h 62:1 245:6,23		hereto 243:7
	haiti 118:3	headquarters 57:3	
granted 97:24	half 23:13		heritage 47:18
97:25 140:1	121:12 143:24	heads 127:2	hiding 117:9
166:5 180:25	150:22 185:13	health 38:5,9	high 234:3
184:6 190:17	185:14	38:18 40:16	higher 116:8
191:4 201:18	handing 33:20	45:21	222:10,11
211:13 234:8	handle 133:4	hear 5:22 7:22	highest 30:21
granting	handled 222:1	8:11,15,24	highlighter
171:15 184:17	222:4 223:14	24:25 25:8	33:6
184:18	happen 145:17	42:19 44:8	hill 104:18
grants 137:19	happened	58:20 68:4	219:11
137:20 138:6	133:12,13,24	89:4 139:9	hired 47:17,18
182:13 183:3	happening	141:7 155:22	213:25 216:2,6
183:12 186:5	98:18	208:20 233:8	historical 29:6
235:23,23	happens 7:25	240:21	historically
gravity 235:10	91:20 95:5	heard 8:19	166:12 190:20
great 185:2	167:16 176:15	56:16 72:2	191:2,4,11,24
192:19,24	happy 23:21	129:21 130:5	192:2
ground 97:17	58:21 140:21	132:19,20	history 28:10
135:10	155:21 215:20	133:18,18	28:11,12,17
grounds	240:7,11,13	151:23 153:18	51:13 100:3,25
177:20,21	harbor 227:25	153:21 190:18	177:23
group 166:9	hard 210:5	198:12 212:17	home 98:22
179:7 206:15	harms 159:17	240:22,25	99:13,14,15
206:16 218:5	159:18	hearing 13:7	101:21
233:19	hate 15:25	42:22 43:23	homeland
groups 121:5	237:13	46:1 73:2	52:18 84:22
grow 138:7	hawaii 51:16	156:19,19	159:3,15,16,17
guatemala	head 4:17 5:22	held 69:21	172:16 209:4,7
74:22 95:13	7:3 72:10	help 24:5 193:5	218:5,21
100:4	86:20 87:4	193:10 215:3	honduras
guess 9:3,7	126:23 191:16	215:11	74:22
18:14 111:19	header 47:16	helped 124:19	honestly 14:3
199:8,12		helpful 9:2	24:13,16 199:8
guidelines	53:6	32:19 33:2	216:23
84:14,21 85:5		195:3	

honor 37:5	hundred 222:8	ifl 211:5	illegally 74:19
237:21	223:4	ifr 43:4,5 44:16	88:14 89:12,19
honored	hundreds	45:14 53:15	90:1 147:20
239:25	234:21	63:7,20 73:11	176:16
honors 37:4	hungarian 50:8	95:20 96:4,25	ima 141:21
hope 101:10	50:17,20	97:7,20,23	immediate
160:6 240:3	hungary 50:13	117:22 136:18	146:23
hopefully	50:14	137:3,5,14,15	immediately
20:23 22:23	i	137:20 138:6	34:25 87:8
hoping 207:8	i.e. 190:19	138:11 141:10	208:6,12
hostile 161:24	i589 170:22	141:15 142:13	immigrant
hostility 160:23	178:12,13,24	142:16 144:8	210:20
161:7,23,25	180:14,17,18	155:6 169:23	immigrants
162:7	237:6	170:4,22	226:10
hour 18:16,16	i589s 180:24	175:15,20,23	immigrate
59:10 140:12	237:3	176:8 178:4,17	146:22
140:12,15	ice 96:11	182:12 183:7	immigration
hours 18:13	124:16,17	183:11 184:1,2	2:12 3:10,12
24:15,18,20,21	126:14 127:20	184:5,10,11,13	12:17,18 14:25
25:13,15,16,17	127:20 128:10	184:18,22	16:12 17:4
140:8,8 189:4	129:1,2 130:10	185:6 198:21	19:7 26:21
242:10	130:14,17,24	199:3 200:21	27:2,5,6,7
house 40:20	131:5,9,11,12	201:5 205:12	39:18 41:18,21
41:9,19 43:24	134:12 135:5	207:10,18	51:1 53:21
43:25 70:16	156:25 167:3	213:25,25	54:1,2,5 55:21
76:19 77:12	174:25	219:1 231:5,8	56:23 57:5,11
82:13 104:19	idea 54:8 61:21	231:11 235:15	57:20 60:20,21
104:20 124:12	159:15 181:20	236:17	61:10 65:2,3
125:25 220:12	216:20 237:8	ifrs 135:16	67:22 69:22
224:23 226:3	ideas 234:24	ignored 110:24	70:4 71:4
household 25:4	identification	110:25	73:23 74:24
huge 74:14	20:8,16 22:18	ii 76:16 229:17	76:20 77:18
84:6	192:14 195:6	229:23	86:8 98:2
hugo 100:9	identified	ij 166:14	104:4,19
huh 7:4	99:17	ijs 190:19	137:20,24
human 100:25	identifying	191:1,3	138:14 142:20
235:6	218:8	illegal 121:25	149:10,20
	210.0		150:6,8 151:2

[immigration - individual]

		I	1
151:6,16	implausible	71:5,5 117:12	increase 88:13
153:19 154:6	146:9,18 147:7	117:14 142:18	90:1 97:11
155:1,14,17	147:11,14,15	159:24 160:7	136:19 137:19
156:4,11,17	147:17,19	164:14,22	137:21 147:23
158:21 162:15	148:3	168:4 171:3	179:21 181:11
162:17 173:3,4	implementati	177:19 180:16	181:16 182:12
173:15,18	40:22,23 89:11	181:20	183:2 211:12
175:6 180:2,2	137:2,5,18	inadmissibility	increased
183:18,19,25	138:12	177:20,22	89:12 91:8
184:7 191:3,21	implemented	inadmissible	114:21 143:20
193:9,25	83:4 90:4,5	117:13	183:13,14
194:11,18	110:2 118:2	inauguration	increases 91:3
197:4 206:4	137:16 139:1	111:21	92:7
210:13,23	140:4 170:4	incarceration	increasing
214:15 215:2	implication	147:24	107:10 182:14
216:17 218:17	241:3	include 23:20	211:10
221:22 222:4	implicitly	35:22 177:10	incremental
222:16,20,23	198:20,24	199:13 220:2	139:1
224:9,14,15,20	199:6	242:1	indefinitely
224:22 225:1,3	important 7:14	included 37:1	92:7
225:5,12,13,17	119:10 149:25	45:4,15 64:6	indent 121:13
225:18 226:1,2	189:7	72:9 168:8	independent
226:14,18,20	impose 147:1	178:7	72:17 132:14
226:21 232:3	207:22 211:14	includes 39:17	index 3:1,5
235:23 238:21	imposed	159:18 194:13	indicate 193:7
238:25 239:9	207:13	205:17	194:15
239:11	imposes 65:6	including	indicated 15:22
impact 28:15	imprecise	12:20 40:9,15	111:15 122:11
53:6 146:10	209:20	42:4 73:11	indicates
182:12 225:21	imprecisions	83:1 84:8	119:19 200:21
226:12,14	131:2	100:3 239:5	indicating
236:17	improperly	inclusive	162:24
impacts 39:19	116:18	136:11	indication
226:5 236:21	improvised	incomplete	194:10
impasse 35:24	157:14	9:25	indicative
36:4	ina 56:19 57:9	inconsistencies	207:15
impeach	69:19 70:3,3	167:17 179:12	individual
166:23 167:5	70:12,18,22,25		58:18,25 91:14

[individual - intonation]

92:4 117:18	216:16	inside 205:16	193:19 196:16
156:19	information	insight 206:17	199:24 200:2,4
individuals	40:1 47:12		216:14 218:11
56:13 63:11		inspection 117:12	
	95:19 122:21		interior 91:6
71:15 74:7	122:24 123:6	inspector	116:18 121:21
75:1,4 80:17	124:15 126:2	160:11	162:21
80:22,23 82:10	126:22 132:1	instance 89:6	internal 100:19
89:19 90:21	135:20 178:7	177:8 189:22	111:11 167:16
91:16 93:19	199:12 203:10	199:2,9 221:22	174:4
95:6,24 96:1,8	203:12,13,19	instances 63:23	international
96:12,16 97:10	203:20 205:13	instant 6:5	104:7,9,12
97:10,11,23	205:15 218:14	instigation	165:12
98:3,20 100:5	218:15 221:10	165:15	interpretation
101:5 108:1	223:16	institute 50:9	54:13
109:20 117:11	informed	50:21	interpretations
117:16,21	132:13 201:23	institution 56:9	57:8
118:24 119:13	202:2,13,15	56:10	interview
119:21 120:13	203:4,25 204:3	insurance 38:5	155:7 163:15
120:25 121:5	204:3,18 205:1	38:19 40:16	164:1,2,7
124:16 138:14	informing	45:21	167:1,9,10,24
139:23,24	79:14 216:18	intends 189:17	168:15,20,21
140:2 144:15	inherently	intention 117:9	169:6,10,19,20
146:19 147:20	179:21 180:6,7	intents 243:17	175:23 178:5
159:19 164:23	181:11	interact 231:9	184:3 193:20
176:9,16,24	initial 11:24	interest 57:25	194:1,14
180:1,23 197:5	144:14 152:9	63:23,25	232:14
206:4 211:13	184:9 193:8	interested	interviewed
indulge 85:24	initially 199:4	126:21 225:2	184:4
indulging	input 60:11	245:14	interviews
163:23	112:19	interesting	163:5 166:11
industry	inquire 206:3	21:9 49:13,13	167:13 168:11
229:23	inquiries 224:4	122:8 131:13	169:15 193:18
inevitably 7:25	ins 37:6,9,10	interfere 11:15	194:6 196:16
influence	69:21 104:14	42:17	199:18,20,23
137:10	112:18,20	interim 17:23	200:2 201:5,16
influx 74:14	219:10	141:20 149:4	205:16,16
inform 45:18	insecurity	155:6 168:15	intonation
131:16 133:6	100:18 102:2	169:24 170:1,2	186:16 187:17

100.11	1		
189:16	jaddou 157:25	77:14 78:3,16	216:14
investment	158:2,4 160:11	78:21 79:6,13	jointly 48:16
91:19,21	160:13 161:6	79:25 80:3,8	joke 187:4
invited 49:12	162:24	86:16,23 94:11	189:11,15
involve 57:25	janet 112:19	96:11,22	237:20,20,23
93:15	january 82:13	123:21,25	238:13,14
involved 12:6	86:7 89:15	129:24 130:3	joking 186:17
36:22 100:1	111:19 117:5	136:20 139:16	187:17 238:17
162:10,15	japanese 228:1	140:18 142:10	joseph 72:9
involving 36:20	jnprm 144:8	143:10 158:11	journal 50:8
206:14	214:4	181:13 186:9	judge 5:21 6:4
issue 71:18	jnprn 213:11	186:14,22	9:15 15:16
85:6 137:13	213:21,24	187:12,21,25	16:6 22:9,20
155:18 179:18	job 1:25 12:15	188:5 189:6	23:25 24:25
226:23	12:15,17 32:2	192:22 193:13	44:8,25 53:21
issued 64:21	32:3 35:20	196:6 200:12	54:1,2 55:21
83:11,18 84:14	37:18 75:25	204:14 208:13	56:2,2,3,3,4,4
86:7 87:4,8,12	122:12 173:25	212:13,19,23	56:23 59:19
94:21 96:11	216:15 243:25	217:18,21,25	60:21 62:21
118:17,18,18	244:25	219:12 221:2	64:21,22 65:2
122:18 137:15	jobs 34:11	222:18 223:17	67:17 76:15
152:10 165:1	john 2:3 3:4	224:6,13,18	80:14 86:25
185:20 202:24	4:13,23 5:8,13	225:8,15,23	94:21 98:2
217:5 218:12	13:19,20,23	227:6,21 228:6	108:19 109:5
232:2	14:5,17 15:4,7	228:19 229:3	109:12 122:17
issues 17:3	15:14,20 16:22	229:10,15,19	141:5 150:8
27:6 36:23	17:13 18:8,19	229:22 230:5,7	151:16 156:17
39:19 40:21	20:17 21:8,16	230:10,16	165:6 173:4
41:8,18,21	21:21 22:7,19	232:15 233:9	186:11,14
47:3 90:12	23:12 24:3,5,9	233:24 234:20	190:13 192:17
104:14 197:4	25:18 33:25	235:8,19	195:2,15
216:17	36:10 42:8	237:12 238:1	196:10 198:10
items 34:19	43:8,16 44:13	238:11,19	200:17 218:1
j	44:17,20 45:24	240:2 242:8,15	221:23 222:4
j 158:3	46:11,25 47:25	242:20 246:1	222:16 224:14
jackson 2:10	59:11 62:11,18	joint 29:24	224:21 225:16
Jackson 2.10	65:8,16 66:8	31:9 144:9	227:8,10 231:1
	67:6,25 73:19	149:3 214:4	231:16 232:3,3

[judge - laser] Page 32

234:9 237:14	justice 2:4,11	47:13,17 49:6	knowledge
237:16 238:12	191:20 228:20	52:23 57:14,15	131:18 152:5
238:14,20	k	57:18 58:4	196:21,24
239:8,9,11,14		59:20 61:18	198:4 199:17
240:9,21	k 221:22	72:6,18 75:9	200:1,6 212:7
241:22 242:11	kaczmaryk	75:13 78:14,18	218:16,20
judges 54:6	122:17	79:19,21 84:7	228:20 243:5
61:10 71:4	karnes 65:1,20	85:16 93:16	known 13:10
137:21 142:20	keep 12:18	97:17 100:7	82:9 85:5
150:6 151:2,17	25:9 80:1	101:6 102:14	227:23
154:7 173:15	140:21 185:1,2	103:7 107:1,2	knows 139:11
173:19,19	221:21 222:13	107:14 110:8	krikorian 19:6
191:3 193:9	222:22,25 240:7	110:18,24	1
194:11,19	keeps 74:25	111:4,10,13,20	1 50:8 134:19
judicial 174:7	137:25 223:24	111:23 112:3	231:17,17
judiciary 40:20	kenneth 229:19	113:20 122:9	labor 35:25
41:3,9,19,20	229:22 230:7	122:10,12	36:5
70:16 71:14	kent 76:15	126:20 128:2	lack 64:3
104:19 124:12	kept 220:23	131:21 134:11	139:12 144:17
125:25 226:3	key 109:4	135:13 139:22	178:11
julie 215:22,24	150:11 226:23	140:24 141:16	lacked 68:24
216:5,25	kids 145:13	142:1,1 148:5	lacrosse 234:12
july 25:4 32:3	kind 53:5	151:2 153:16	lafayette 1:2
64:24	62:13 86:2	155:15 158:16	language 49:24
jump 135:13	103:16 130:20	159:17 160:5	59:2 61:8 64:1
143:19	136:25 202:12	163:6 165:6	118:7 128:6
juncture 29:11	kingdom 54:24	172:9 173:1	131:3 168:9
138:8	knew 61:20	181:18 184:15	203:6 209:20
june 95:13	151:18 197:10	186:22 190:1	237:5
135:21,22,23	200:16	191:15,16	languages
136:5 185:11	know 4:23 6:21	195:15 197:1,7	80:18
200:20	8:7 9:3,5 10:1	197:7 205:19	large 53:5
jurisdiction	10:6 13:23	211:2 212:14	100:11 103:23
41:20 56:8,11	14:1,2,3,7 19:5	214:25 215:22	194:19
57:5 65:3	19:9 20:4 21:4	218:4 219:15	larger 138:7
68:22 71:6	25:2 26:16	221:16 222:9	laser 107:9
162:20 171:19	32:19 45:12	229:2 234:13	101.7
225:1	32.17 13.12	234:15 239:22	

[lasted - local] Page 33

lasted 89:17	98:25 99:2,4	levels 74:23	listed 37:14
late 60:24	100:19,21,23	114:12	233:16
72:19 100:6	102:20 137:11	lifted 134:16	listen 112:22
latest 135:15	154:22 183:13	185:21	lists 34:11,19
law 12:16	leadership	light 195:21,24	litigation 2:12
14:25 16:12	109:10	likelihood 91:4	12:2,19 46:18
17:4 27:8 30:3	leads 183:12	92:3 94:8 95:1	47:8,10 51:15
30:6,8,13,16	190:21	95:17 96:5	little 11:23,25
30:19,22,25	learner 203:7	164:4 168:9	27:17 33:15
31:5,12,13,13	learning 13:4	233:21 234:4,8	40:4 41:12
32:12 41:4,6	leave 98:21	likely 91:5,14	42:17 45:16
46:25 47:3	241:3	109:20	50:3 51:17,18
54:13 55:22	led 58:17 85:10	limen 50:7	53:20,23 64:15
57:8 65:6 67:7	136:18	limit 129:19	85:23 106:11
67:16,22 68:11	left 29:9 32:4	172:13	128:7 130:9
68:14 104:4	legal 64:16	limitations	135:12,13
149:9,10,12	65:17 66:4,9	64:17	136:13 138:17
159:4,22 160:1	67:3 68:9	limited 97:18	140:6,7 163:3
160:9 162:1,6	206:5 241:22	156:12 193:24	163:5 169:23
165:18 210:6	241:23 246:23	196:2,3	173:12,13
214:25 215:1,3	legislation	limits 65:5,14	180:11 184:23
215:11 216:2	70:15,16	66:4,5	188:14 197:11
216:25 224:9	legislative	line 112:14	198:6 201:21
224:16 225:5	51:12 69:25	121:12 143:24	207:21 209:18
lawful 116:1	letter 109:9	144:6 157:14	210:4,19,25
218:11 226:10	110:14,21,22	179:19 183:7	211:16 219:13
lawfully	111:9 119:12	206:23,23	228:7 235:16
117:17,19	206:8 210:12	211:25 231:6	236:7,23
176:11 226:9	214:17 215:3	232:24 237:13	live 92:5 95:8
lawsuit 12:5,5	215:11,15,16	244:4,9	145:10,11,13
12:13,15,24	215:18 216:11	lines 8:4	lives 145:13
lawsuits 12:19	216:21	121:11,13	living 17:2
134:6	letters 133:19	160:25 161:2	75:15 145:1,6
lawyer 156:20	206:2	list 61:19 82:7	197:3
lawyers 18:21	letting 126:19	123:3,18	loans 31:22,22
lays 179:3	level 100:5	126:25 205:7	31:24
lead 56:22	101:25 116:17	223:13 244:4	local 37:25
58:25 95:21	120:22 176:22		38:6,20 39:2

[local - make] Page 34

20.16 40.10 10	176.10 170.16	loudly 7.15	221.16 222.10
39:16 40:10,18	176:19 179:16	loudly 7:15	231:16 233:10
42:7 43:14,18	192:7 193:9	louisiana 1:1	made 60:14,19
45:22 46:10	195:18 200:4	2:4,5 13:14,21	66:19,22 70:9
localities 39:20	205:4,5 206:22	14:5 16:14,19	74:6,22 77:17
226:22	211:2 220:19	26:7,12,24	79:11,13,25
location 47:14	223:9,20	27:4 67:22	80:8 83:4 84:8
49:15	226:20 237:4	140:11,15	84:8 95:13
logistics 42:14	looked 17:16	198:19 201:12	108:6,15
140:6	40:20 41:21	202:13,20	124:14 166:23
long 18:11,15	42:9 103:18	204:5,9,10,12	166:24 179:2,9
22:14 36:1	222:5,6 226:4	204:19,22	179:11 180:19
45:16 53:21	looking 15:11	205:2,11,14,19	181:16,19
89:17 96:25	21:1 42:11	206:6 207:14	186:14,22
119:24 140:25	94:2 104:2	207:16,23	189:8,11,13,15
149:12 150:13	110:14 121:10	210:8,21	190:10 196:15
151:5 191:23	136:1,3,8	211:15 213:19	207:7 211:19
195:13 222:6	191:12,24	214:8,16	237:16 239:5
233:21	194:10 226:12	louisiana's	243:8 244:4
longer 53:24	looks 31:11,16	201:23	magazine
108:7 109:16	34:15,16 86:4	low 74:23	228:9,12,14,25
149:17,19	212:1	116:8	magyar 50:17
150:18 151:13	lord 235:9	lower 56:15	mail 3:8 4:25
151:14 152:6	lost 155:19	168:2	6:5 20:13 22:3
153:6 154:5,6	lot 18:2 24:24	lowers 96:7	126:23
154:12,13,16	25:6 29:4,5	lowest 115:12	main 124:11
155:2 156:5	38:10 41:17	loyola 28:1,3	maintained
look 14:22 15:5	54:11 56:15	lunch 140:19	142:19 223:19
16:13 20:3	59:4,4 60:13	lunchtime	maintains
23:1 35:15	64:2 75:14	140:9	223:13
39:19,20 48:23	87:12 89:21	lynch 64:20	major 30:12
49:1 52:21,24	97:16 104:8,9	67:12 231:16	majority 74:17
55:23 58:14	112:5,5 125:13	m	74:22 137:24
59:3 60:18	125:23,24	m 50:8 81:13	217:2
81:17 87:1,10	167:18 197:24		majors 28:16
88:6 97:8	227:7,10 238:7	macroecono 29:7	28:19,20
103:18 140:6	238:20 242:12	madam 119:20	make 5:2 6:25
142:2,22 147:8	loud 73:9	134:19 158:2	11:5 17:11
164:8,9,10,13		134.17 130.2	18:13 19:24
	1	1	1

	T	I	
27:20 33:16	malitia 161:17	54:20,21 89:2	152:1 166:19
37:13 39:6	162:5	109:6 244:6	167:1,21,22,23
44:11,13 52:23	mandated	matthew	168:14 173:20
60:12 62:16	231:17	122:17	meant 88:23
71:3 77:3 80:3	march 17:24	mayor 226:24	108:25 115:7
85:2 88:16	69:20 113:23	mayorkas	202:22
91:19 96:18	114:25 115:2	84:15,22 95:23	mechanics
97:12 104:10	124:25 141:22	109:5,14	216:22,24
113:10 115:17	172:14 220:13	mean 17:20	234:13
117:7 120:15	margaret 19:8	18:4 19:18	mechanism
126:15 128:3,5	mark 19:6,21	29:2,13 31:21	94:25
128:9,23 129:6	20:7 111:22	45:8,9 55:13	media 95:18
130:6,15,17,22	marked 20:8	60:1,2 63:14	medicaid 38:4
130:23 131:4	20:16 22:18	69:4,6 70:3	38:18 40:16
133:17 134:25	181:6 192:14	91:12 92:14	45:21
135:14,17	195:6	97:14 98:14	medical 38:5
138:10 139:14	marks 33:6	102:5 105:9	38:19 40:17
141:17 142:4	married 38:7	108:21 117:2	45:22
145:12,14	marsh 4:15,18	129:8,12 133:1	medicare 38:11
146:20 154:18	9:11 42:18	133:20 143:9	146:21 147:21
155:23 166:1	185:3 240:16	151:23 161:3	147:22
173:24 174:11	242:12 245:6	162:2 163:12	meet 18:7,11
175:10 178:6	245:23	163:15 164:20	18:15,21
182:20 188:23	maryland 28:2	165:10 166:17	member 71:19
189:24 198:16	master 152:9	170:9,19 176:3	72:3
211:1 221:11	masters 38:8	180:10 196:25	membership
226:11 228:5	matching	197:24 198:24	166:8 233:18
229:1 233:22	135:18	201:2,7 202:18	memo 84:16
234:7 237:24	material 17:6	209:18 212:14	85:5 87:4
237:25	materials	212:14 216:8	memory 24:14
makes 8:5,6	15:24	220:25 232:8	25:13 33:15
33:21 85:24	math 125:1,5,9	232:17	41:16 43:11
91:13 109:19	126:3,7 127:9	meaning 131:7	44:18 87:16
making 172:9	127:11 186:3	means 7:3 25:2	mental 11:14
172:21 173:22	186:17 237:16	39:22 41:22	mention 48:6
174:19 187:3	237:24	42:11 82:3	99:16 205:10
218:22 244:7	matter 14:15	83:15 141:17	211:5
	17:10,19,21	146:24 148:8	

[mentioned - moment]

mentioned	127:17	93:18 98:24	mission 108:7
19:16 25:18	mexican 120:5	113:16 116:17	109:16 159:12
26:22 32:12	120:9	migrations	218:9
37:18 39:8	mexico 74:19	93:11	misspoke 71:8
48:21 49:10	82:10 91:22,24	mind 16:21	162:13 178:21
51:7 57:10	103:6	52:15 82:6	mistake 85:3
70:9 85:19	miami 199:2,13	85:12,15,24	157:17
99:19 100:15	200:3,6,22	87:19 105:16	misunderstand
101:13 102:23	michael 61:24	196:11	136:25
112:1 115:18	61:25	mine 105:17	misunderstan
127:6,11 130:8	microecono	192:18 215:1	114:24
165:8 178:15	29:7	217:2	mixed 101:8
194:21 197:12	microsoft 7:9	minimis 140:5	model 220:17
197:14 199:11	middle 31:17	minimize 44:21	220:22
203:19 238:8	146:6 147:2	minor 30:15	modeling 218:4
mentioning	migrant 82:8	minors 28:22	218:6 219:20
27:16	88:1,10,10,12	29:19	models 105:11
meritorious	90:2,3,6,9,25	minute 6:2	105:12
54:23 144:17	94:10 95:2,4	36:19 61:16	modified 209:8
merits 156:19	100:21,23	127:6 152:15	modifies 131:4
168:15,20	102:20 103:24	177:2	modifying
169:10,15,20	104:2,5 119:14	minutes 59:12	77:23
193:18 196:15	136:18 206:16	61:11 98:7	mom 24:23
199:23 200:2	218:7,8 220:18	106:4 178:10	moment 17:12
232:14	migrants 63:2	188:15 217:16	19:24 20:24
merkel 49:17	74:15,18 88:14	217:22 229:25	37:22 39:5
merrick 1:7	89:12 107:10	240:10	44:6 46:4
246:4	109:1 117:6,9	mislead 79:15	48:25 59:7
message 6:6	119:16 121:25	189:24	61:7 71:8 74:9
met 18:18	129:11 139:5	misleading	77:2,25 85:20
24:11,15 25:18	227:2 231:18	66:9 67:8 78:3	85:22,25 87:5
71:15	migrate 99:1,3	78:16,21 79:8	94:3 98:6
method 105:20	99:5 137:11	139:17 238:12	106:2,14 121:9
methodologies	139:15	mispronounc	127:13 133:21
104:24 105:25	migration	158:5	145:21 150:4
methodology	48:12 49:10	missed 152:11	157:11,18
103:15 105:13	50:8,20 51:9	152:20	167:20 192:12
105:15,20	53:7 93:3,6,15		194:25 196:5

[moment - non] Page 37

198:17 208:19	mpp 82:9 90:4	74:25	240:8
209:15 217:9	90:4	nationality	needed 156:21
240:7	multiple 61:9	55:2,16 70:4	244:8
monetary	86:7	166:8 233:18	needy 39:1
226:21	mute 157:12	nationals 74:20	42:6 46:9
money 14:15	217:9	118:2	negative 101:2
27:11 29:8	muted 5:25	natural 135:6	never 52:15
120:13,15	n	206:14	70:7 71:25
129:15 145:12	n 4:1 50:8	naturally	105:3 107:13
145:14 201:11	81:13,13	241:25	167:15 182:4
month 73:5	134:19	nature 235:6	nevertheless
monthly 114:9	nadir 113:24	navigation	146:9
114:12 116:2	114:7 115:2,3	197:23	new 139:10,11
124:8 125:12	115:9 116:5	nda 219:21	157:23 197:18
125:22 127:8	nail 17:11	near 199:5	199:3,13,16,20
months 32:1	name 34:17,18	nearby 100:20	200:22 226:25
36:2 86:10	81:12 85:4	101:7	238:9,9 239:20
89:18 115:12	86:13 87:5	nearly 190:17	news 25:8
136:5,10 137:9	99:11 111:25	necessarily	newspaper
222:17	named 118:21	182:12 226:13	75:14,17,20,22
moratorium	228:20 243:15	necessary 71:2	75:25 76:3,11
87:6	names 46:17	168:7	77:9
morgan 111:22	82:5 119:1	need 7:2,4 10:5	newspapers
morning 9:20	narcotics	15:3 16:13	75:24
morton 96:21	120:12	22:17 25:1,10	nhs 152:3
mother 25:9	narrow 232:16	80:4 87:1	nicaraguans
motivate	234:5	95:22 127:13	118:3
144:14	narrows 234:5	131:16 132:25	nine 52:10,12
mouth 95:6	national 30:8	133:4 140:24	52:14,17 53:14
move 10:17	48:11 75:24	142:24 157:17 173:20 184:24	nod 7:3
41:24 68:16 198:6 223:7	104:17,20	173:20 184:24	nodding 4:17 noise 129:21
moved 28:4	159:6,8,19	190:4 193:3	130:6 198:12
32:4,6	177:22 219:22	200:4 202:7	noises 42:15
movement	224:25 225:17	200.4 202.7	non 166:12,18
93:12,18	236:14 237:11	203.1 223.8 226:13 227:15	166:19 167:1,7
moving 106:16	nationalities	228:1,4,12,16	175:12,16,23
143:22 211:16	54:14,19,20,21	229:5 237:15	1/3.12,10,23
143.22 211.10		447.3 431.13	

noncitizen	214:4 216:14	116:5,8 118:19	78:21,24 79:12
148:14	noticed 157:16	123:10,13	79:13 80:8
nondetained	186:25 189:12	124:13,18,18	86:16,22,23
56:5 151:23,24	notices 217:4	124:19,22	94:11 96:22
151:24 152:2,6	noting 44:22	126:10,20,21	123:23 136:20
153:6,12,20,25	notwithstand	127:4,7 133:19	139:16 143:10
154:7 236:4	64:4 132:8	157:17 185:10	158:11 181:13
nonpartisan	134:14	185:24 205:20	188:24,25
239:3	november	nutrition 38:25	193:13 196:6
nonprofit	41:11 58:5,8	42:5 46:8	200:12 204:14
161:10	nta 118:17,18	nuts 5:24	208:13 219:6
norm 140:13	118:18	0	220:21 222:12
normal 12:15	ntas 138:14	o 4:1 47:12	223:11,22
normally 59:21	number 3:6	62:1 81:14	224:11,17
121:4	47:13 59:5	119:20 134:19	225:7,14,22
north 2:4 4:13	83:12 89:25	158:3 231:17	226:16 227:18
4:16,19 38:9	97:11 116:9	o'clock 184:25	228:3,15,22
57:14,15,18	121:20 122:6	oath 4:6,12	229:7,13 230:2
58:23 59:20	122:13,14	9:16,17,20	230:8,14
140:16 239:6	123:1,15	77:13 178:25	231:10 233:4
245:1	124:22 125:5,6	obama 83:2	234:17 235:5
notary 243:12	125:15 139:23	object 15:7	235:18 236:19
243:21 245:6	139:25 143:1	42:8 43:8	237:22 238:5
245:24	143:14 151:10	187:23 188:9	238:15
notch 121:8	177:19 179:23	188:10 239:17	objections 80:3
note 64:25	180:1,23	240:21,22,25	188:23 189:4
71:13 81:6	183:13 185:15	241:2	obligated
88:25 236:2	185:18,21,23	objected 233:9	201:23 203:25
240:2 246:10	186:7 192:5	objecting	observe 234:25
noted 44:21	197:17 205:10	188:25 189:1,2	234:25,25
65:24 66:7	209:1 211:10	objection 15:4	obtain 223:15
74:1,3 243:7	221:25 222:3	43:16 44:17,20	obvious 151:12
notes 106:17	222:10,14,15	44:22 45:24	158:16 187:4
114:16 115:17	222:23 232:21	46:11,25 65:8	189:11,15
135:17 188:22	244:4 245:24	65:16,22,23,24	229:4
notice 3:7 20:7	numbers 63:1	66:7,8 67:6,25	obviously 13:9
21:14,20 144:9	89:18 100:11	77:14 78:3,16	22:13 100:24
149:3 187:25	113:25 114:9	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	

[october - okay] Page 39

october 12:25	174:3 176:13	26:16,19 27:2	106:1,2,23
13:8 27:10	177:25 196:15	27:17 28:11,16	107:4,7,14
90:8 213:15	235:23	28:19 29:12,16	108:4 109:15
214:9 215:4,7	officers 36:23	29:23 30:2	111:1,13,18
215:12 216:12	71:7 135:24	32:11,15,17,21	112:16,23
odds 48:6	142:20 164:8	33:10,11,14,17	113:3,7,19
offend 97:15	167:17 170:5,6	34:2,8,23	114:11,15,23
offense 97:16	171:7 172:1,9	35:10,13 36:11	115:18 116:10
offer 13:15	172:21 173:22	36:18,24 38:2	116:23 119:1,4
14:14,20 50:21	174:11,19	38:13 39:9,11	120:4 121:17
76:21 94:20	175:10,25	39:13,24 40:3	121:18 123:3
95:11 156:8	176:2	40:5 41:1,23	123:13 125:4
167:3,4 214:1	official 1:7	41:24 42:24	126:4,12,15,19
offered 206:8	142:1 165:16	43:13 44:6,11	127:3,12
offering 14:16	165:17 243:20	45:6,12 46:7	129:12,18,22
189:25	officials 206:3	46:16,20 47:22	130:3,5 133:8
offers 58:9	227:1	49:18,21 50:19	133:11 134:18
office 2:12 3:10	ofo 122:23	51:17,23 52:22	135:11 136:2,4
3:12 4:6 18:22	124:17 127:21	52:25 53:2,13	136:13,24
18:22 19:4	127:24	53:17,17,25	137:7 138:16
26:8 69:22	oh 21:6 22:25	55:25 57:10	141:15 142:3
75:4 84:7 86:6	34:8 36:8 95:5	59:9 60:1,11	142:12,22
89:17,24	209:9	61:3,15,23	143:5,14,22
104:14 110:12	okay 5:11,15	62:4,14 63:17	144:3,24 145:4
118:16 122:23	6:1,11 7:17 8:3	64:10,15 66:1	145:19,19
127:25 153:18	8:18 9:9,11,12	68:13 69:4	147:15 148:23
170:12 191:20	9:15,23 10:2	72:1,22 79:5	149:5,16,20,24
199:2 202:16	11:10,14,22	80:20 81:4,25	150:8,19
203:20,22	13:3,12,17	85:8,18 87:18	152:15,25
204:4,19	14:4,7,12,19	87:22 88:6,16	154:4,15
219:25 239:18	16:3,15,24	88:20 90:9,23	156:17 157:2
239:25 244:5	17:5,16,20	91:11 92:8,19	157:11 158:24
officer 4:11	18:7,11,21	93:5,9,21,25	160:16 161:2,5
69:8 98:1	19:11,14,21	94:16 95:20	161:14 162:9
141:21 159:24	21:22 22:9,23	96:4 97:13	162:19 163:3
160:8 163:12	23:1,4,8,11	99:4,9 100:24	164:7 165:5,23
164:1,3 167:11	24:4,14,20	102:5,17,22	166:17 167:6
167:19 173:6	25:21 26:6,9	103:14 105:5	167:20 168:17

[okay - page] Page 40

169:9,17,22,24	68:18 107:23	156:6,9	ortiz 74:5,8
170:9,19 171:4	109:23 116:12	opportunity	75:13 78:11
171:12,25	140:8 211:2	11:1 40:24	79:22 220:13
172:20 173:15	237:24	66:17 83:8,9	outcome
173:17 175:5	ones 85:12	97:9 102:15	245:14
181:10 182:3	99:21 128:3	104:4 105:4	outside 35:25
182:17 183:24	135:9 149:25	120:15 156:12	47:6 132:16
184:9,14 185:2	205:6	174:24,25	232:13
185:3,21,25	ongoing 47:20	175:2 236:22	overheard 6:13
186:8 187:23	online 75:25	236:23	overlap 17:6
190:25 191:17	177:12	opposing 4:7	25:19
192:4,6,8,19	open 21:6	79:14	overlapping
192:24 193:1,3	68:18 73:13	option 78:23	59:22
193:16,23	77:8 78:8	order 51:14	oversight 41:18
194:3,20 195:8	85:11 95:25	56:18 64:21	43:24,25
195:11,18	96:3 113:16	83:15 91:7	104:18,21
196:1,13,18	122:25 123:11	94:22 152:10	220:12 224:22
198:5,9,24	157:4,6	159:21,25	224:24 226:2
200:9,16	opened 83:6	160:8 164:3	oversize 50:6
201:10 202:8	84:13	165:1,7 171:18	oversized
202:21,25	opening 5:24	189:19 231:15	50:23
203:13,18,23	209:24	231:24 242:18	own 17:24 33:8
204:24 205:10	operations	ordered 152:23	33:21 60:16
206:22 207:8	118:17 122:23	orders 48:11	62:10 78:14,19
207:17,20	127:25	51:13 86:8,14	80:13,13 87:15
208:4,11,22,24	opinion 14:14	87:12	131:25 132:5
209:3,10,17,24	55:17 63:13	ordinary 238:3	132:14 163:25
210:4,25 211:5	94:9 95:20	organization	191:18 193:5
211:8,20 212:9	113:15 119:24	218:14	owned 49:15
213:12,15	137:7,9 138:10	organizations	p
214:2,11,16	166:9 233:19	120:10	p 4:1 119:20
215:14 216:5	opinions 60:6	orient 202:5	p.m. 140:7
216:20 217:3,8	60:16	originating	242:9,22
217:18 235:15	opportunities	195:23	p.o. 2:13
240:20 241:14	63:10 101:14	orleans 199:3	pace 9:11
242:5,17	101:16,18	199:13,16,20	page 3:2,6
once 23:18	102:25 103:8	200:22	21:25 22:16
36:15 67:1	107:10 155:3		

[page - past] Page 41

23:2,14 34:25	panelist 35:23	186:1 190:12	142:23 146:4
35:7,8 37:14	35:25	190:16 198:6	147:14,16
39:7 51:19,20	paper 48:19	198:16 199:13	159:2 162:25
,	50:21	200:18 201:22	190:14 209:24
51:24,24,25			
52:3,3,6,8,9,10	paragraph	202:14 203:23	214:14 216:15
52:12,13,14,17	48:21 49:4,6	205:4 206:10	216:15,16
53:5,8 62:7,22	50:4 62:6,21	206:22 207:5	partial 107:11
68:17 71:8,9	68:16,20,21	207:20 208:9	189:3
86:4 87:24	69:10,15 70:9	208:23,25	participate
113:4 128:4,17	70:24 71:9,10	209:4,18	239:19
141:4,12,23,25	71:12,21 72:11	211:17,18	participated
142:5 143:6,6	73:7,7,8,17	225:5,10 231:2	159:14
143:23 145:22	76:7 80:12	232:20	particular
145:23 146:5,7	81:20 84:10	paragraphs	71:18 73:1
148:10 157:21	86:1,4,11	87:25 143:23	74:4 76:13
192:7,24 193:1	87:20 88:6,7	201:22 211:1,6	89:6 120:2
195:13 198:7	90:24 94:2,7	parallel 175:18	134:10 137:13
205:6 206:11	106:12,14,19	175:20	157:10 166:8
206:12,24	108:4,8 109:22	paraphrase	179:6 199:8
211:23 212:10	110:4 113:3,14	84:17,20 93:25	218:10 219:1
212:22 244:4,9	116:11 118:5	94:1 109:25	233:19
pages 34:12	118:11 119:4	110:23	particularly
35:6,14 37:14	121:8,10 128:7	parol 96:8 97:2	40:21 226:5,22
40:7,13 42:2	134:22 135:12	97:6,10 118:1	236:13 239:23
53:3,14 212:15	135:25 136:8	139:24	parties 245:11
243:5 244:7	136:22 142:22	parole 52:8	245:13
245:16	143:5,9,23	63:11,17,19,21	parts 162:9,14
paid 14:16,18	144:19 145:20	64:11 82:16,19	party 49:16
25:21,25 26:2	145:23 146:4,6	82:20 97:9,19	188:5
26:3,6,20 27:7	148:10 154:19	paroled 96:13	paso 81:2
27:11 67:20,21	154:20,22	parolee 205:20	passed 41:4,6
214:12	157:21 158:1	part 8:24 12:15	96:12
panel 35:24	158:25 160:21	48:7,24 54:12	past 56:25
36:4,5,16,21	162:23 163:4,9	54:13,14 64:23	61:22 70:1
37:17 39:8,11	166:11 179:15	67:20 75:25	97:8 103:18,25
39:15 40:9,15	180:6,21 181:1	91:18,22 95:4	125:3,5,9
49:12,13,13	181:8 182:9,18	95:6,10 134:23	166:24 171:7
72:9	182:22 185:9	134:24 135:2	
, =, ,	102,22 103,7	151,21155,2	

pathways	people 19:4	performs	phrase 88:10
116:1 218:11	56:16 75:8,10	218:24	88:16,18,19
patience 21:12	76:21,25 79:20	period 41:19	98:5,7 132:19
129:4 145:21	80:20 83:5	50:25 66:18	132:20,20
192:13 195:1	90:14,15 93:17	67:10 89:10	151:24 191:1,5
patrol 74:5,7	95:4,15 98:17	110:8,11 111:3	202:1 212:17
74:18,25 79:4	99:1,3,5 104:8	111:4 112:6	phrasing 41:25
107:25 108:16	104:9 125:24	148:25 154:8	192:2 203:24
110:3,15,16	137:11 139:9	154:11 182:7	204:25
111:8,20 112:6	139:14,25	231:8 236:5,16	physical 11:14
112:7,11,19,23	145:1,6,10	236:22	65:12 66:3
112:25 114:10	147:24 157:8	periods 103:23	picture 83:25
122:14,22	177:7,10,11,14	154:13,15,25	pin 142:6
127:21 218:10	184:8 190:1	156:3	piso 119:20,22
220:13	205:11	permits 184:11	pitch 95:10
pause 25:10	people's 75:18	permitted 4:11	place 6:12
148:20 161:16	perceived	persecution	90:16,16
162:6 203:1	73:11 74:10	55:19 166:6,7	110:19 111:5
pay 91:17	75:19 77:24	233:15,16,17	111:11,14
119:22 214:16	78:6 84:12	persistently	174:2 177:7
214:19,22	percent 26:13	62:24 63:8	187:19 193:19
paying 26:17	96:16 107:6	person 6:6	206:18 207:17
26:18 27:1,3,4	138:4 190:18	13:18 19:8	209:12,16
peaks 114:20	194:16 220:14	93:22 165:17	placed 87:6
114:22 115:18	220:14,15,15	personal 40:24	134:6
115:20,23	perception	66:20 78:15,19	places 53:19
pearl 227:25	75:18 80:14	161:17 162:5	55:3 112:15
pedantic 230:4	81:24 83:5	personally	199:4 201:6
pedigree 90:20	85:10 113:15	243:16	204:24
penalties 232:9	perfect 9:13	pertinent 179:4	plainly 180:9
pending 6:7	perfectly 133:5	phase 90:5	234:5
10:11 94:23	140:21	phd 32:15	plaintiff 190:3
96:8 162:21	perform	phenomena	214:22
pennsylvania	177:12 185:22	207:10	plaintiffs 1:5
56:9,11,12	performed	phenomenon	2:2 13:13
penthouse	164:8 199:5	120:3	18:22 26:17
228:8,9,11,13	201:5 222:8	phone 79:17	27:1 216:3,6
228:25	236:1	80:5	

[plan - potter] Page 43

plan 84:2	135:3 139:7	23:20,21 25:1	population
planning	141:5,19	56:24 74:8	138:8,9
217:14	142:15 145:8	95:23 96:14	pornographic
play 187:3,6,7	145:20 152:1	103:3 108:5	228:12,14
189:10,18	156:1 157:21	109:4 148:24	pornography
playing 187:10	158:6,19 160:4	159:11 186:4	229:2
189:20	162:3 163:5,6	191:9 211:19	port 117:19
please 6:3 7:3,3	163:25 164:20	221:5 230:17	portion 21:24
7:10,15,25 8:4	165:9 166:4	points 118:15	217:1
8:8,16,21 9:1,3	168:14 170:14	123:2,3 125:19	portrayed
9:4,25 10:5,12	173:20 174:16	163:14 197:4	117:15
10:16,20 14:13	182:9 185:10	police 178:2	ports 117:7
15:18 16:7	185:18 186:12	policies 12:19	posed 159:19
17:22 20:3	187:20,24	28:14 53:7	position 146:9
26:4 34:5 36:3	188:12,15	73:11,22 75:11	190:6
42:16 44:1,7	190:12 191:12	76:25 77:6	positive 142:17
44:21 45:1	192:8,11,25	78:6 80:15	148:15 171:8,9
46:16 47:11,14	194:25 197:1	81:25 82:1,6	171:21 172:3
47:22,24 49:7	200:19 201:4	82:14,25 83:4	172:10 174:20
51:11 52:23	202:18 203:1	83:14,20 84:12	175:9,9,10
55:8 59:7 62:7	203:19,21	85:9 89:11	176:1,3
68:18 69:17	204:3,16	107:14,16,21	possession
75:22 79:2,18	206:11 207:9	110:1,2 111:10	221:13
79:20 81:12	211:2 242:19	111:24 112:13	possibility
82:5,7 85:15	244:3,7,8	117:25 225:13	159:19 173:9
85:25 86:13	plural 82:1	225:21	possible 45:17
94:3,6 95:3	plus 39:7,8,10	policy 12:16	72:16 98:13
99:9,11,11	39:10,14,15	27:8 82:3,10	147:24 159:17
106:2,20	40:8,8,14,15	82:15 86:9	173:16
108:24 109:23	42:2,3 82:16	88:1,21 90:2	post 191:7,13
111:2,5 116:13	82:19,20 97:22	90:25 91:13	191:18 196:23
121:3,9,9	100:2 143:24	225:18 226:12	posts 57:21,23
123:4,23 124:6	143:25	226:14 239:6	57:24 151:8
125:9,21	plyler 17:23	political 49:16	potentially
126:24 127:13	205:23 210:9	55:16 99:14	92:6 183:20
127:16,17,23	210:22	110:25 112:24	potter 228:21
129:8,13 133:2	point 7:18 9:23	166:9 233:19	228:24,25
133:21 134:9	10:24 14:4		

power 68:24	18:19 19:2,17	pretend 79:20	problem 33:7
120:18 131:8	24:5	pretend 79.20 pretty 12:22	89:3,4 123:8
		25:15 26:12	·
132:18,23	prepared 18:23 19:19 24:2	55:15 126:1	procedural 175:3
practical 93:23			
105:12	presence 84:18	234:2 238:23	procedure
practice 234:1	198:19 205:11	prevent 11:19	12:20 180:13
234:2	210:7	66:4 159:9	proceed 190:7
practices	present 49:12	164:24 165:13	190:8
189:23 190:4	50:21 147:20	189:19	proceeding
practitioners	155:2 156:5	previous 51:6,6	152:4 166:21
155:15	167:3 170:14	83:1 103:23	166:25 170:15
precedent	175:3 176:21	previously	174:22,23
171:14 193:22	210:21 245:11	46:22,24 69:21	245:9,9
precisely	presentation	pride 239:3	proceedings
207:24 210:1	70:15	primarily	142:21 162:22
predated	presented	114:3	166:14,25
213:25	48:18,20 157:6	primary 71:6	179:10 245:18
predictable	157:7	80:14	process 18:5
91:1,11 92:9	presenting	printed 33:20	19:23 52:1
234:22 235:17	78:23	prior 65:4	70:2 71:16
235:24	presidency	72:10 83:14	97:24 98:4
predictably	120:8	135:8 163:2	107:25 131:6
235:2	president	170:21 188:7,8	141:21 142:16
preexisted	48:10 83:23,25	217:7 245:8	164:3 166:20
228:24	84:6 86:6 87:9	priorities 84:16	170:8,10,11
preexisting	89:16,24 95:12	priority 85:5	174:7 175:4,13
180:18	95:14 100:10	prison 56:12	175:15,20,21
preface 230:6	100:10 110:16	privilege 6:9	176:17,23
prefaced	131:24 132:14	pro 161:9	177:2,4 179:4
180:16	161:17	probably 24:17	184:5 211:12
prefatory	presidential	25:15 36:13	237:10
227:12	51:14	72:5 123:5	processes
premise 91:2	press 19:8	147:13 152:25	151:18
preparation	82:13 125:24	163:22 176:6	processing
12:1 16:15	pressing	184:12 199:9	107:9 108:1
24:2	133:22	209:20 223:1,3	109:1
prepare 16:25	presumably	probe 166:22	proclamation
17:7,14,17	219:2,14,15		51:14

[produce - put] Page 45

produce	90:4 144:17	49:3,9 50:5	144:12,18,25
219:23	162:5 164:9,11	51:7,8 60:10	145:3 194:22
produced	164:15,22	61:16,17 228:8	207:3 218:4,17
122:16,17	168:1	publications	218:21 230:19
216:25 217:1	protocol	126:6,25 127:9	pulled 83:25
production	107:22 117:12	127:10	pulling 101:23
15:24	protocols 82:9	publicized	102:11
program 38:25	90:4	207:7	purely 221:12
42:5 46:9	provide 125:15	publicly 116:16	purposes 20:11
82:12 118:1	178:2 205:24	173:6	22:15 39:9
139:10,11	provided 23:16	published	243:18
176:14 177:15	40:1 51:1	17:23 50:7,13	purse 132:18
226:14	120:13 122:21	50:14,16,18	132:23
programs 38:5	122:25 125:18	51:8,8 60:8,8,9	push 98:10,14
38:19 39:20	126:14 127:4	141:22 239:7	98:19,22,25
40:17 45:21	203:12,14	publishers	99:2,4,8,10,12
prolonged	219:24	61:19	99:24 100:2,15
154:8	provides	publishes	100:18,25
promise 23:22	120:14 206:16	114:10 118:14	101:2,15,21
prompt 244:5	provision	pull 76:25 77:2	102:3,19
pronouncem	139:24 149:3	77:19,21 78:7	103:17 104:25
198:20	165:20	85:19 87:23	105:14 109:17
pronouns	prwora 40:22	98:6,10,14,16	136:13 218:3
173:13	40:25	98:22,25 99:2	218:16,21
proper 88:15	public 27:6	99:4,7 101:17	232:12
117:20,21	39:22 41:22	101:21 102:3	pushing 101:22
232:9,9	42:11 43:8	102:12,16,20	102:10
proposed 144:9	44:18 61:13	102:22,24	put 20:22
145:25 149:4	125:16 146:21	103:9,11,17	22:13 59:13
207:18 214:4	146:24 148:8	104:25 105:14	71:21 76:6
216:14,19	182:14 195:12	109:17,19	77:2 101:5
217:4	197:4 205:17	121:13,17,22	119:1 123:15
protect 159:3,8	216:17 226:6	123:1 136:14	124:22 126:21
187:4,12,13	226:25 243:12	136:18 137:10	127:7 133:8
protecting	243:21 245:6	138:10,19	157:11 169:24
159:16	245:24	139:8,14 140:1	173:15 183:7
protection	publication	140:3 143:25	190:6 192:11
69:11,13 82:8	48:12,15,16	143:25 144:3,4	194:25

[putting - read] Page 46

putting 20:10	189:5 193:3,16	quote 58:24,24	rates 54:9 55:1
108:8	196:22 201:2	62:23 63:8	56:23 58:19
q	214:6,7 215:10	107:8,8,11	59:1,6 184:16
qualifying	227:20 230:25	108:5 110:5	191:3 195:22
92:23	233:7,11,12	121:12,13,14	221:23
quantified	239:6 240:15	121:17,22	rather 16:19
210:9	240:22	143:25 144:3,4	71:3 120:3
quantify	questioning	144:12,13,18	207:6 229:1
207:24 210:1,5	45:3 231:6	146:11 160:22	ratings 58:10
210:16,18	232:24 237:14	200:20 228:24	reach 114:12
quarter 59:10	questions 5:14	quotes 107:7	124:22 190:4
182:8 194:16	6:16 7:5 8:9	143:25	reached 49:18
	10:16,20 11:24	quoting 148:17	61:17 113:23
question 6:7 8:4,5,12,13,15	22:16 23:21	r	115:3
	33:17 47:2	r 4:1 62:1	reaches 95:3
8:16,20 9:4	62:15 63:5		reaching 236:6
10:11,12 16:20	79:8 97:19	165:20,20	read 16:21
38:14 39:10	142:12 149:6	175:25 221:6	57:23 58:1,4
40:3 44:25	156:14 157:1	232:4	58:11,15 59:4
46:25 53:13	157:23 163:7	race 55:16	60:22 63:3
63:20 65:24	166:22 167:11	166:7 233:18	69:2 73:8,14
66:13,25 67:7	179:3 202:6	railroad	75:14,24,25
72:3,16 73:18	208:5 217:13	239:24	76:1,3,4,11,23
78:18 79:2,10	217:15,20	raised 156:14	77:9 86:3,11
79:18 86:18,19	232:22 240:6	226:24	87:25 88:4,8
86:20 90:17	240:20 241:5	ramifications	90:23 91:9
94:23 96:24	242:6,13	29:6	113:13,17
97:5,5,6,20	quick 20:3	range 24:15	116:21 118:7
101:19 111:2	59:19 188:22	222:20	121:16 122:1
113:8,12	quickly 97:24	ranges 58:18	128:13 134:24
136:14 138:22	98:13 146:20	59:1	142:23 143:8
138:24 144:10	236:2	rate 54:1,5,18	156:1,2 161:5
149:17 150:5	quiet 6:12	56:15 103:2	161:6 182:10
151:12 155:20	quite 85:2	179:22,25	182:15 188:4
156:1,2 157:1	94:19 102:1,1	180:9 181:12	198:22 200:25
158:16 160:14	107:23 139:11	181:17 182:11	208:2 225:9
173:18,19	210:17 237:19	183:2,14 191:8	233:10,12
174:9 181:25	210.11 231.17		242:15 243:3
	www.ConitalPana		272.13 273.3

[read - reflected]

Page 47

04400455	 0 - 1-	4440.00	404.0.405.55
244:3 246:9	recall 87:15	44:18,23 48:22	181:8 182:22
reading 58:2	127:15 224:10	59:10,17 65:25	225:5
60:19 77:8	229:24 231:6,7	79:25 88:25	reference 33:8
146:3 151:3	232:24 237:17	92:2 106:10	72:2 74:4
195:13	recalling	123:24 129:24	75:23 76:9
reads 146:2	236:10	130:16 141:24	81:19 83:23
200:20	receipt 246:18	148:15 155:12	128:25 136:22
ready 163:10	receive 29:9,12	157:9 161:5,6	163:1 218:25
real 123:8	31:8	166:22 186:9	referenced
181:20 223:7,8	received 20:10	186:23 187:4	119:11 127:24
realize 9:23	26:9,15 27:12	187:12,13,14	148:1 180:23
53:9	31:3 32:13	187:21 188:14	191:7 207:1
realized 157:8	142:17	188:16,19	218:13 224:1
202:7	receiving 56:14	189:6,7,13,14	246:6
really 12:21	recent 57:17	189:19 195:14	referencing
14:11 18:1	100:25 120:3	215:9 217:11	72:25 195:10
36:12 57:16,25	121:19 232:1	217:13,18	referrals 186:4
92:17 103:1,8	recently 74:17	231:14 243:6	referred 61:21
117:8 125:25	124:12	recordable	84:16 90:3
126:1,8 143:19	recess 59:15	187:1	161:16 176:20
194:12 212:21	106:8 141:2	recorded 188:2	181:3,5 184:6
220:17 223:2	188:17 217:23	189:12	201:17,19
239:21	recognized	recording 5:7	referring 71:10
realtime	68:24 105:15	5:12 186:25	76:18 107:20
220:23,24,25	225:11	187:7,7,22,24	114:2 135:2
reason 11:18	recollection	189:3	142:5 161:11
56:8 91:22	15:11 16:10	records 221:7	161:20 177:5
111:6 112:4	72:17 87:2	223:24	191:5 202:23
155:8,11	220:2 222:9	red 84:1	215:19
171:19 172:20	230:17	reduced 91:5	refers 88:13
172:23 173:7	recommenda	105:19	refine 238:10
180:25 216:16	110:23	reduction	reflect 186:16
244:9 246:11	recommenda	62:25	194:18
reasons 147:19	110:21	reentry 232:10	reflected 108:3
181:16	record 4:4,22	refer 12:4 39:7	108:16,23
reauthorization	5:21 7:1 15:23	76:17 125:21	109:12 191:6
69:11,13	17:25 20:11,17	127:5 163:17	196:3
	23:12 43:9	167:19 180:17	

			I
reflects 111:6	95:8,17 116:16	14:24 16:7,8,8	removals 87:6
189:17 201:16	117:8 118:18	16:13 18:1,20	removed
reform 104:21	121:20,23,25	24:7,8,11,16	152:23 159:25
224:24	124:13 139:24	34:13,20 36:3	160:8 164:24
refresh 33:15	184:12 211:11	36:11,12 37:20	165:7
87:2	231:24,25	45:4 47:15	reno 112:19
regarding	releases 116:17	48:22,23 60:19	repeat 8:12,13
198:21	122:14 123:10	60:22,25 61:5	8:25 38:14
regardless	123:11 127:20	61:23 71:24	58:21 99:19
182:11	127:20	72:20,23,24	128:3 152:17
regrettably	releasing 109:2	83:24 84:3	160:3 174:16
131:2	146:19	85:4 87:11	208:20
regular 104:15	relevant 239:7	93:1 100:3	rephrase 40:3
regularly 81:10	reliable 219:3,8	108:8 112:13	report 3:9 12:2
regulation 64:8	relied 111:12	113:1 126:4,5	19:18 22:13
148:18 164:15	123:10 197:9	127:17 134:10	23:2,7,15,24
165:19 169:12	relief 166:5	138:17,21	24:1,6,9,12
169:24	167:25 169:7	144:7 147:10	25:14 26:1
regulations	169:10	151:3,4,7,10	27:19 32:22,25
169:13	relies 219:4	154:23 178:18	34:3 35:1 40:7
regulatory	religion 55:16	197:10 209:15	40:13 42:2,24
168:24	166:8 233:18	213:6,9 216:21	48:9 51:18,19
relate 17:3 47:3	relocate 100:12	216:23,24	53:18 59:8
related 15:24	relocation	229:16,18,20	62:5,9,13,16
27:16 41:21	100:19,20	remind 35:10	68:9,17 72:12
86:2,8 98:10	rely 20:19	remote 7:10	81:5,16 87:19
159:18 245:12	23:14 132:24	22:5	87:20 94:11
relationship	133:1 218:21	remotely 57:16	103:14,15,19
121:6,7	relying 132:3	removal 52:5	105:6,22,23
relatives	remain 82:9	91:5 94:9 96:6	119:2 123:4,19
146:23	91:22,24 92:6	96:18 142:21	124:7,21 126:1
release 64:2	230:18,22,23	152:10 162:21	131:14,19
82:13,25 83:8	remainder	162:22 164:5	132:2,17 135:4
91:6 107:21	208:9	164:11,19,21	141:4 168:13
108:2 129:10	remained	165:1,2,3	178:3 182:21
138:13 231:18	115:23 116:8	167:22 170:15	185:19 196:20
released 80:24	remember 13:1	170:23 171:5	197:8 198:3
91:15 92:4	13:4,5,7 14:10	171:18	200:21 201:10

	1		
202:24 204:25	require 92:17	109:1,11,18	responding
209:1 211:9,10	171:18 178:2	111:11,15	216:18
211:21,22	required 76:9	117:24,24	responds 94:10
212:12,13,13	122:16 132:2	118:13,25	response 101:4
212:14,18	205:24 219:20	119:21 120:2	213:11,21
219:24 225:6	219:21	120:23 121:3,5	216:13 224:4
231:3 232:21	requirement	122:10,22,23	226:23
241:11,15,18	179:20 219:16	123:9 124:13	responses 7:2
241:25 242:3	231:4,5 237:7	124:16 125:11	responsibilities
reported	requires	125:24 129:9	55:21 69:20
116:19	131:13 184:13	129:10 131:12	71:1 214:14
reporter 4:9,11	242:3	132:24 133:15	responsibility
4:14,19 6:16	research 80:13	135:6,8,9	40:24
7:12,22 8:6	80:14 81:5,15	137:13,19	responsive
9:13 10:25	reserved	138:2 139:21	88:1,20,23
42:21 155:25	242:21	155:18 162:12	90:25
156:2 185:4	resettled 227:3	165:21 168:3,4	rest 74:24
233:10,12	resident 12:16	168:23 174:2	85:14 208:23
240:13,17	27:8 205:25	179:5,25 180:3	restrictions
242:17 245:4	resolution	182:1 184:19	101:5 134:4,5
reporting	231:4	196:22 197:12	134:7,15
119:19 122:25	resolve 152:7	200:5 204:17	result 235:2,17
reports 55:23	153:20 236:18	205:21 207:14	resulting 73:10
representation	resource 63:17	216:17 221:21	84:11
20:19 23:15	63:19 64:11,13	222:25 223:16	results 175:25
representatives	resources	225:17,20	219:2
95:24	62:24 63:9	226:5,6,22	resum 30:2
reputation	64:10	227:2,2 232:4	34:14,17
160:22 161:7	respect 36:23	234:6 235:22	retained 71:7
161:23,25	40:21 54:12	235:25 236:13	retired 27:13
request 16:2	57:7 60:20	238:18 241:21	36:8
47:22 48:1	63:10 66:16	respond 217:4	return 91:20
130:19 131:24	67:11 83:8	respondent	244:5 246:13
188:12 205:25	87:3 89:23	156:21 179:13	246:17
207:7 210:22	93:8 95:13,15	181:25	returning
requests 15:23	97:3 100:2,18	respondents	165:14
124:14 221:11	101:7,17 105:1	54:14,21	reunification
	107:19 108:14		103:9

[review - saw] Page 50

review 3:10,12	116:6,7 122:4	robust 173:2	rulemaking 144:9 149:4 214:5 216:15 216:19 217:5 rules 4:24 5:5,9 11:11,24 rulings 56:22 running 125:3 205:7 222:22
10:24 43:9	126:5 127:16	218:23,24	
60:10 69:23	128:6,17	rodney 106:21	
153:19 173:1,4	130:11,14	role 50:6,23	
173:8 174:2,8	134:20 135:14	224:23,25	
175:1 191:21	135:21 136:10	226:2	
246:7	140:17 141:13	rolled 235:15	
reviewed 17:9	143:6 144:5	235:16	
19:16 23:5,5	145:17 146:3,7	rollout 139:1	
75:21 167:18 reviewing 17:3 172:24 rewrite 85:3 rides 102:5 right 6:22 11:22 12:9 19:24,25 23:6	148:21 149:1 149:10,22 150:9,20,23 153:2,3 165:24 166:20 172:18 175:7 178:12 178:17,20 179:15 183:4,7	room 4:10 33:19 79:21 189:10 root 76:19 rouge 2:5 rough 24:23 44:4 223:2 round 125:17	223:1 runs 45:16 russian 28:12 28:13,15 rustling 42:15 42:16,22 ryan 2:9 189:9
25:18 26:24	183:16 184:20	125:17 roundhouse 239:23,24 rounding 166:2 routinely 157:2 row 157:19 rule 15:8 17:23 86:17,24 116:1 139:23 141:20 141:21 143:12 145:25 148:3 149:4 155:6 160:19 168:16 170:1,2 180:13	s 4:1 81:13
27:12,15 43:1	185:16 191:9		119:20 232:4
44:12 47:9	191:15 192:2		sabraw 232:4
48:22 49:19	198:17,22		safeguarding
51:21 52:1,10	199:14 201:21		236:14
52:15 57:12,21	202:6,9 204:22		safeguards
62:17 65:15	207:18 208:12		175:3
66:6 67:5,17	209:1 211:23		sales 95:10
67:23 70:12,24	212:2,5,10,12		salvador 74:21
78:11 79:11,21	212:22 213:16		100:4
81:22 82:1,3	229:24 234:16		sample 138:25
83:16 85:2	235:12		san 104:6,7,10
87:16 90:24	rights 210:11		sarah 2:10
91:24 92:24	rio 81:2		sat 89:8
97:1 100:22 101:10 102:11 102:20 104:2 106:16 107:12 107:18 110:6 110:11,18 114:3 115:10	rise 100:8 risk 159:20 177:22 rob 216:24 robert 214:25 215:1,3,11 216:2	180:14 193:19 196:16 199:24 200:2,5,13 201:7 218:11 232:12 235:25 236:6	saw 4:16 5:22 53:18 74:20,23 75:8 84:5 89:16,23,25 94:21 96:10,14 104:11,21

[saw - second] Page 51

133:24 196:4	31:1,6,12,13	182:2 185:5	65:24 66:7
saying 20:21	31:14 32:12	186:10,20	79:24 86:22
24:21,22 36:19	145:14 207:14	187:9,18,23	106:21 107:15
41:15 63:18	schools 147:1	188:3,8,18	108:4,14 109:9
64:11,12 77:4	207:16 210:14	189:16,17,22	110:13 116:20
77:5 82:1 86:2	210:24	190:1,8,11	116:23,25
94:8 107:20	schultz 2:9 3:3	192:15,20,23	123:22 124:1
111:4 112:3	4:4,7,15,21 5:7	193:15 195:7	140:11 141:24
114:7 117:22	5:11,15,20	196:9 197:3	142:8 186:12
118:6 130:21	9:10,14 10:21	200:15 204:15	186:20 187:9
134:2 136:16	12:9 15:13,15	208:17 212:16	192:20 217:14
137:8,8 139:9	16:3,5 17:2	212:21,25	242:6,12 246:1
139:13 183:1,2	20:9,20 21:9	213:1 217:12	scott's 107:2
183:6 188:1	21:19,22 22:8	217:19 218:3	109:7,15
195:3 199:10	23:17 25:11	219:6 220:21	111:12 119:11
210:16	33:23 34:1	221:6 222:12	scratch 13:6
says 21:20	36:17 42:13,23	223:6,11,22	screen 20:18
34:10,15,18	43:12,20 44:20	224:1,8,11,17	21:13 192:17
35:1 50:7	44:24 46:6,15	225:7,14,22	screened
52:14 53:6	47:5 48:2,4	226:16 227:18	176:12 177:16
58:9 68:20	59:13,16,18	228:3,15,22	177:18
86:6 88:1	62:8,14,19,20	229:7,13 230:2	screening
90:25 91:1	65:11,21 66:10	230:8,14 231:2	164:2 176:15
113:18 116:15	67:15 68:2	231:10 232:20	177:1,4,7
132:3 133:3	73:25 77:22	233:4,8 234:17	scroll 35:3,16
136:5 141:10	78:9,17,24	235:5,18 236:4	192:25 193:10
142:15,25	79:1,10,23	236:7,19	scrolling 21:13
144:12,22	80:1,6,10,11	237:22 238:5	seal 243:20
146:7 147:3	86:18 87:13	238:15 239:22	second 9:11
161:6,8 179:19	94:15 96:24	240:3,5,15,19	35:8 36:14
182:11 190:16	97:4 106:1,9	242:5,9,19	106:13,18
202:1 203:4,24	123:22 124:1,4	science 234:24	114:17 126:17
206:20 211:25	130:4 134:1	scope 132:16	135:20,25
scale 139:22	136:23 139:18	scott 2:3 4:8,8	144:3,12,18
schedule 113:2	140:11,20,23	4:21 13:19,20	146:6 152:13
239:12	141:3 142:8,11	20:9 21:15	179:19 185:11
school 30:4,6	143:13 155:25	22:3 33:23	185:14 189:21
30:13,16,19	156:16 158:14	48:3 62:8,19	198:3 203:1

	T	I	
206:23,24	49:7,8 50:4,10	seeks 117:18	134:24 135:3
209:24	52:5,21 53:8	seem 88:25	135:20,25
seconds 160:3	63:17 74:16	114:23	143:2 144:21
secretary 84:15	75:5 76:21	seemed 115:13	146:6,8,11
84:21 95:23	85:23 87:10	seems 90:10,14	147:2 160:4
96:19,21 209:4	88:2 89:18	102:9 130:21	161:4,6,8,11
209:6	91:20 94:2	seen 57:17,17	161:14,20
section 2:12	97:9 100:4,11	74:14 75:4,21	163:2 182:10
56:18 57:8	100:12 105:4	75:23 77:7,10	185:11,15
69:18 70:3,11	106:7 108:11	89:10 96:15	190:15,16
70:18,19,22,25	113:24 118:8	105:12 114:13	198:18 200:19
71:4 117:12,13	119:6 127:1	116:2 235:21	200:20 203:3
142:18 159:23	128:11 129:2	semi 131:14	206:13,24
160:7,12,17,20	136:6 141:11	senate 72:8	208:7,12
164:14,21	141:14 143:3	109:10 110:14	209:25 225:9
168:3,24 171:3	144:1 146:12	senator 72:19	229:12 230:6
171:15 177:19	146:14 147:3,4	207:7 210:22	sentences 86:5
178:5 180:15	148:17,19	send 15:18	88:7 161:13,22
180:16 181:19	160:24 166:15	47:23 60:7	separate 25:16
183:21	192:16,20	119:16 126:23	114:8,18
security 48:11	195:5,24 197:6	130:19 131:14	115:19
50:7,24 52:19	198:14 200:23	131:19 145:13	separately
84:22 103:1	202:1,25 203:8	sense 85:24	25:25
104:17,20	205:8 206:19	175:18 200:10	separation
159:3,7,8,15	206:20 207:25	sent 20:13 22:3	231:25
159:16,20	209:9,12 210:2	58:13 59:20	september
172:16 177:22	211:5 218:25	60:9,10 109:9	41:10 84:15,22
178:1 209:5,7	229:2 233:5	110:13 119:14	84:24 104:5
218:6,21	235:1	131:19 206:2	109:10 110:14
224:25 225:18	seeing 21:24	246:14	111:8 114:13
236:14 237:11	52:22	sentence 58:15	119:11 121:24
see 15:6 20:4	seek 56:18	90:23 91:1	135:21,23
21:4,6,14,15	seeking 117:16	92:8 106:13	136:6 180:20
21:17,19,25	128:9,23 129:6	107:17 113:13	185:12
22:6,10,17,20	130:15,17,22	113:14 116:12	serially 104:17
22:23,24 23:19	130:23 131:3	121:11 128:8	series 6:16
30:2 32:22	134:25 177:20	128:13 129:6	seriously 112:8
33:9,23 35:4	177:24 179:6	130:11 134:23	

[serve - social] Page 53

serve 112:2	shift 224:7	significant	141:13 149:11
served 35:23	shocking 110:5	89:14 138:3	184:24 188:4
41:10 112:17			188:12 218:2
	112:16,17 short 91:7	140:1,3 221:19	
148:15 222:16		236:20	sitting 189:9
service 36:22	92:23 236:21	significantly	190:1
services 38:6	shorthand	234:6	situation 128:9
38:19 40:17	120:6	similar 9:17	128:23 129:7,8
45:22 158:8,21	shortly 89:24	34:16 138:24	129:9 131:4
159:13	show 22:15	155:2 156:5,8	133:5 135:1
set 6:1 14:15	34:24 44:3	176:7 201:2	157:7
26:3,4,22	75:18 124:21	203:24 237:5	six 52:3,6
33:24 45:12	125:6 127:9,11	similarities	199:18,20,21
63:15 130:18	157:15 161:22	237:4	skills 237:17
149:13 171:2	181:10 192:12	similarly	skip 135:12
184:10 188:20	192:25 193:8	203:25	146:5 168:18
196:2,4 198:14	222:3 241:18	simply 116:19	211:17,17
sets 131:22	showed 35:7	127:5 188:11	skyrocketed
142:16 184:5	213:4 222:7	201:15 224:20	143:2,15
238:9	showing	234:6	slight 115:25
settlement	233:23	single 26:1,3	slightly 179:18
64:19 231:9	shows 105:20	231:12	183:10 185:7
seven 52:8	118:20	sir 6:9,10,14,19	slip 163:24
150:17,18,19	shut 101:3,4	6:23 8:2 17:15	slowly 35:3,16
242:10	235:9	18:24 19:20	small 31:22
several 149:21	shutting	22:22 23:3,7	116:2 138:7,9
229:25 238:22	134:13	24:7 25:3,23	138:25 139:11
sewer 25:5	side 81:8	27:23 28:6	238:23
shannon 56:9	119:13 120:21	29:14,18 30:1	smooth 54:17
share 35:2	sign 214:8	30:11,14,17	smuggler 91:17
59:23	242:16 246:12	31:7,10,15	91:19
sharing 21:13	signature	32:16 35:9,12	smugglers
sharp 166:12	211:25 212:1,2	43:2 44:5	95:11,15
189:23 190:4	242:21 245:23	45:11 52:16	120:25 121:4
sheet 243:7	signed 16:14	53:22 57:13,22	snap 146:21
244:1,5 246:11	24:10 26:11	63:16 67:18	147:23
shell 116:20	165:13 178:25	69:12 70:6	social 166:9
117:3,4,23	212:6,7,8	80:18 83:17	179:7 233:19
	213:18 246:20	102:21 136:22	

[societies - st] Page 54

societies 226:5 196:2 198:8,9 space 64:3,5,12 77:11 97:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:7 99:22 149:1 99:22 149:1 99:22 149:1 159:8 175:22 159:13 18:13 225:13,18 225:13,18 39:10 14 29:10 14 29:11 14 20:11 14:14 <th< th=""><th>• • • • • •</th><th>10191000</th><th></th><th></th></th<>	• • • • • •	10191000		
softer 228:7 208:6,18 215:6 129:20 131:12 159:8 175:22 solicit 112:22 216:9 229:9 132:10 178:19 218:13 solid 123:9 241:15 spaces 65:13 specify 87:14 solidarity sort 28:11 spanish 81:9 specify 87:14 solidarity sort 28:11 spack 7:7,11,15 51:9 66:15 100:21 66:15 100:21 50:2 72:4 speculate 180:11 speculate 180:21 speculate 180:21 speculation 180:21 speculation 180:21 speculation 180:21 speculation 180:21 speculation 180:21 speculate 180:11 speculate 180:21 speculate 180:21 speculate 180:11 speculate 180:11 speculate 180:11 180:11 180:11 speculate 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11 180:11	societies 226:5	196:2 198:8,9	space 64:3,5,12	77:11 97:7
solicit 112:22 216:9 229:9 132:10 178:19 218:13 solid 123:9 241:15 spaces 65:13 specify 87:14 solid arity sort 28:11 spanish 81:9 specify 87:14 48:12 49:11 30:12,15,18 speak 7:7,11,15 speculate 180:8 51:9 66:15 100:21 50:2 72:4 speculation 246:23 120:6 121:6 80:71,18,19,20 180:21 somebody's 122:9 164:9 81:10 141:24 speculation 59:24 170:17 187:19 speaking 4:7 182:1 someone's sorts 151:17,18 speaking 4:7 183:10,13 son 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 spend 25:14 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 speaks 84:10 spell 47:11 5:25 21:23 20:27 82:18 19:17 203:18 special 149:14 spend 25:14 50:22 66:12 20:321 228:2,5 specially 30:18 split 48:18 65:22 66:12 20:221 30:24 spoken 16:17			,	
solicitor 2:3 230:3 232:3 spaces 65:13 specify 87:14 solidarity sort 28:11 spanish 81:9 specify 87:14 solidarity sort 28:11 spanish 81:9 specify 87:14 solidarity sort 28:11 spanish 81:9 specify 87:14 solutions 101:2,7,19 50:27:24 speculation 180:21 somebody's 122:9 164:9 80:17,18,19,20 speed 108:1 184:16 someone's 151:17,18 151:22 238:9 speaking 4:7 184:16 speediness son 235:11 144:16 speaking 4:7 183:10,13 speediness son 151:122 238:9 sought 62:25 182:14:16 speediness son 155:13 166:2 spell 47:11 speediness sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 speaks 84:10 spend 25:14 spend 25:14 spend 25:14		,		
solid 123:9 241:15 spanish 81:9 specify 87:14 solidarity 30:12,15,18 51:9 81:10 speculate 180:8 solutions 101:2,7,19 50:2 72:4 180:21 somebody's 122:9 164:9 80:17,18,19,20 speed 108:1 somebody's 122:9 164:9 80:17,18,19,20 speed 108:1 someone's 151:17,18 sorts 151:17,18 speaking 4:7 speediness somon 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 speaks 84:10 spell 47:11 soorn 156:10 sound 6:24 188:24,25 spend 25:14 52:52 1:23 source 78:10 188:24,25 spend 25:14 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:23,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 specially 30:18 112:11,14 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 30:24 130:8 154:16 14:71 144:4 south 75:7 125:14 153:22				
solidarity sort 28:11 30:12,15,18 speak 7:7,11,15 180:11 speculate 180:8 180:11 speculation 180:11 speculation 180:21 182:12 182:12 182:12 182:12 182:12 182:12 182:12 182:13 182:12 182:12			_	,
48:12 49:11 30:12,15,18 speak 7:7,11,15 180:11 51:9 66:15 100:21 16:11,24 18:25 speculation 246:23 120:6 121:6 80:17,18,19,20 speed 108:21 somebody's 122:9 164:9 81:10 141:24 speed 108:1 59:24 170:17 187:19 speaking 4:7 someone's sorts 151:17,18 speaking 4:7 149:21 151:22 238:9 44:22 65:23 speediness son 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 speaks 84:10 spell 47:11 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 speaks 84:10 spell 47:11 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 speaks 84:10 spell 47:11 sorry 5:11,24 213:11 126:2 188:24,25 spend 25:14 sorry 5:11,24 203:21 22:25 42:21 25:18 39:11 48:18 <			_	
51:9 66:15 100:21 16:11,24 18:25 speculation 246:23 120:6 121:6 80:17,18,19,20 speed 108:1 somebody's 122:9 164:9 81:10 141:24 speed 108:1 59:24 170:17 187:19 scorts 151:17,18 speaking 4:7 183:10,13 someone's sorts 151:17,18 speaking 4:7 44:22 65:23 speediness son 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 235:11 sound 6:24 155:13 166:2 speeling sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 speell 47:11 5:25 21:23 source 78:10 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 spit 48:18 52:23,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 29:12 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 239:21,22 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 specific 12:21 167:20 <				_
solutions 101:2,7,19 50:2 72:4 180:21 246:23 120:6 121:6 80:17,18,19,20 speed 108:1 59:24 170:17 187:19 226:19 speediness someone's sorts 151:17,18 226:19 speediness 149:21 151:22 238:9 44:22 65:23 speeding son 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 235:11 144:16 118:23 137:4,9 spell 47:11 soon 156:10 sound 6:24 155:13 166:2 spell 47:11 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 spend 25:14 5:25 21:23 source 78:10 188:24,25 spend 25:14 24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 94:12 158:12 spent 28:1 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:25 specially 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 specific 12:21 167:20 14:21 19:21 <		, ,	_	180:11
246:23 120:6 121:6 80:17,18,19,20 speed 108:1 somebody's 122:9 164:9 81:10 141:24 184:16 59:24 170:17 187:19 226:19 speediness someone's sorts 151:17,18 speaking 4:7 183:10,13 149:21 151:22 238:9 44:22 65:23 speeding son 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 235:11 144:16 118:23 137:4,9 spell 47:11 soon 156:10 sound 6:24 155:13 166:2 81:12 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 spend 25:14 source 78:10 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 94:12 158:12 161:8 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11	51:9		· ·	_
somebody's 122:9 164:9 81:10 141:24 184:16 59:24 170:17 187:19 226:19 speediness someone's sorts 151:17,18 speaking 4:7 183:10,13 149:21 151:22 238:9 44:22 65:23 speeding son 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 235:11 144:16 118:23 137:4,9 spell 47:11 soon 156:10 sound 6:24 155:13 166:2 spell 47:11 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 spend 25:14 5:25 21:23 source 78:10 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 94:12 158:12 161:8 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 239:21,22 72:22 78:10 67:20 82:18 229:12 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 160:13 108:22	solutions	101:2,7,19		180:21
59:24 170:17 187:19 226:19 speediness someone's sorts 151:17,18 speaking 4:7 149:21 151:22 238:9 44:22 65:23 speeding son 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 235:11 sound 6:24 155:13 166:2 spell 47:11 soon 156:10 sound 6:24 155:13 166:2 spell 47:11 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 spend 25:14 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 speaks 24,25 spend 25:14 sorry 5:12,23 31,24 speint	246:23		80:17,18,19,20	speed 108:1
someone's sorts 151:17,18 speaking 4:7 183:10,13 speeding son 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 235:11 144:16 118:23 137:4,9 spell 47:11 soon 156:10 sound 6:24 155:13 166:2 spell 47:11 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 spend 25:14 5:25 21:23 source 78:10 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:18 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 13:18 52:16,18 167:20 144:7 144:4	somebody's	122:9 164:9	81:10 141:24	184:16
149:21 151:22 238:9 44:22 65:23 speeding son 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 235:11 144:16 118:23 137:4,9 spell 47:11 soon 156:10 sound 6:24 155:13 166:2 spell 47:11 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 spend 25:14 5:25 21:23 source 78:10 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 239:21,22 72:22 78:10 67:20 82:18 229:12 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 specific 12:21 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 14	59:24	170:17 187:19	226:19	speediness
son 234:10,12 sought 62:25 78:24 80:2 182:13 183:3,6 soon 156:10 sound 6:24 155:13 166:2 spell 47:11 soorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 spend 25:14 5:25 21:23 source 78:10 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 94:12 158:12 161:8 spent 28:1 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 spent 28:1 52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 239:21,22 72:22 78:10 67:20 82:18 229:12 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 72:20 80:22 146:14,15	someone's	sorts 151:17,18	speaking 4:7	183:10,13
235:11 144:16 118:23 137:4,9 spell 47:11 soon 156:10 sound 6:24 155:13 166:2 81:12 sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 spend 25:14 5:25 21:23 source 78:10 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 94:12 158:12 161:8 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 30:24 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23<	149:21	151:22 238:9	44:22 65:23	speeding
soon156:10sound6:24155:13 166:281:12sorry5:11,24213:16,17188:24,25spend25:145:25 21:23source78:1094:12 158:12161:824:25 25:8112:10 122:2594:12 158:12161:836:6 41:23123:11 126:2193:14 196:7split48:1852:3,15 53:4191:17 203:18special149:14spoke17:965:22 66:12203:21 228:2,5239:21,2272:22 78:1067:20 82:18229:12specialty30:18112:11,1490:12 92:1sources123:1530:24130:8 154:16106:13 108:22123:18 124:11specific12:21167:20114:21 129:21205:1013:18 52:16,18spoken16:17133:22 140:13south75:776:2 112:1572:20 80:22145:11 146:374:19 117:10165:2,4 176:21202:19146:14,15129:10 143:1202:23 219:19spot145:21160:5 161:4143:15222:1square79:9,15162:13 168:18sovereignspecificallyst2:3 3:4 4:13169:6 171:631:19,23,2417:7 27:194:23 5:8,13172:2 175:932:4 35:2268:22 69:1913:19,20,23184:24 185:1237:16 40:1472:25 73:2414:5,17 15:4,7	son 234:10,12	sought 62:25	78:24 80:2	182:13 183:3,6
sorry 5:11,24 213:16,17 188:24,25 spend 25:14 5:25 21:23 source 78:10 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 94:12 158:12 161:8 split 48:18 36:6 41:23 19:17 203:18 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:3,15 53:4 19:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 239:21,22 72:22 78:10 12:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 specific 12:21 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15	235:11	144:16	118:23 137:4,9	spell 47:11
5:25 21:23 source 78:10 speaks 84:10 spent 28:1 24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 94:12 158:12 161:8 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 239:21,22 72:22 78:10 67:20 82:18 229:12 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 specific 12:21 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 specifically st 2:3 3:4 4:13 169:6 171:6 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13	soon 156:10	sound 6:24	155:13 166:2	81:12
24:25 25:8 112:10 122:25 94:12 158:12 161:8 36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 239:21,22 72:22 78:10 67:20 82:18 229:12 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 specific 12:21 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7 <td>sorry 5:11,24</td> <td>213:16,17</td> <td>188:24,25</td> <td>spend 25:14</td>	sorry 5:11,24	213:16,17	188:24,25	spend 25:14
36:6 41:23 123:11 126:2 193:14 196:7 split 48:18 52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 203:21 228:2,5 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 229:12 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 specific 12:21 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	5:25 21:23		speaks 84:10	spent 28:1
52:3,15 53:4 191:17 203:18 special 149:14 spoke 17:9 65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 72:22 78:10 67:20 82:18 229:12 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 specific 12:21 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	24:25 25:8	112:10 122:25	94:12 158:12	161:8
65:22 66:12 203:21 228:2,5 239:21,22 72:22 78:10 67:20 82:18 229:12 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 specific 12:21 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	36:6 41:23	123:11 126:2	193:14 196:7	split 48:18
67:20 82:18 229:12 specialty 30:18 112:11,14 90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 specific 12:21 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 specific 12:21 167:20 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 13:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign specifically st 2:3 3:4 4:13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	52:3,15 53:4	191:17 203:18	special 149:14	spoke 17:9
90:12 92:1 sources 123:15 30:24 130:8 154:16 106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 specific 12:21 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 169:6 171:6 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	65:22 66:12	203:21 228:2,5	239:21,22	72:22 78:10
106:13 108:22 123:18 124:11 specific 12:21 167:20 114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign specifically st 2:3 3:4 4:13 169:6 171:6 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	67:20 82:18	229:12	specialty 30:18	112:11,14
114:21 129:21 205:10 13:18 52:16,18 spoken 16:17 133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign specifically st 2:3 3:4 4:13 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	90:12 92:1	sources 123:15	30:24	130:8 154:16
133:22 140:13 south 75:7 76:2 112:15 17:13 19:2,4 141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign specifically st 2:3 3:4 4:13 169:6 171:6 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	106:13 108:22	123:18 124:11	specific 12:21	167:20
141:7 144:4 southwest 50:6 125:14 153:22 72:20 80:22 145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign specifically st 2:3 3:4 4:13 169:6 171:6 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	114:21 129:21	205:10	13:18 52:16,18	spoken 16:17
145:11 146:3 74:19 117:10 165:2,4 176:21 202:19 146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign specifically st 2:3 3:4 4:13 169:6 171:6 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	133:22 140:13	south 75:7	76:2 112:15	17:13 19:2,4
146:14,15 129:10 143:1 202:23 219:19 spot 145:21 160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign specifically st 2:3 3:4 4:13 169:6 171:6 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	141:7 144:4	southwest 50:6	125:14 153:22	72:20 80:22
160:5 161:4 143:15 222:1 square 79:9,15 162:13 168:18 sovereign specifically st 2:3 3:4 4:13 169:6 171:6 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	145:11 146:3	74:19 117:10	165:2,4 176:21	202:19
162:13 168:18 sovereign specifically st 2:3 3:4 4:13 169:6 171:6 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	146:14,15	129:10 143:1	202:23 219:19	spot 145:21
169:6 171:6 31:19,23,24 17:7 27:19 4:23 5:8,13 172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	160:5 161:4	143:15	222:1	square 79:9,15
172:2 175:9 32:4 35:22 68:22 69:19 13:19,20,23 184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	162:13 168:18	sovereign	-	st 2:3 3:4 4:13
184:24 185:12 37:16 40:14 72:25 73:24 14:5,17 15:4,7	169:6 171:6	31:19,23,24	17:7 27:19	4:23 5:8,13
	172:2 175:9	32:4 35:22	68:22 69:19	13:19,20,23
185:12 188:24 75:16 76:18 15:14,20 16:22	184:24 185:12	37:16 40:14	72:25 73:24	14:5,17 15:4,7
	185:12 188:24		75:16 76:18	15:14,20 16:22

[st - states] Page 55

17:13 18:8,19	232:15 233:9	186:25 187:22	statement
20:17 21:8,16	233:24 234:20	241:16	17:24 23:5
21:21 22:7,19	235:8,19	started 89:18	64:6 74:11
23:12 24:3,5,9	237:12 238:1	113:21,22,24	77:16 108:15
25:18 33:25	238:11,19	114:12,18	161:1 162:4
36:10 42:8	240:2 242:8,15	118:5 156:19	180:20 186:23
43:8,16 44:13	242:20 246:1	156:20	189:14 191:18
44:17,20 45:24	staff 104:19	starting 28:3	191:19 227:12
46:11,25 47:25	125:23 224:23	111:21 191:9	227:16 228:5
59:11 62:11,18	238:23	starts 145:24	229:1 230:21
65:8,16 66:8	staffer 70:13	146:8 206:13	237:16,17
67:6,25 73:19	staffers 224:5	207:21	239:2
77:14 78:3,16	stage 90:5	state 1:4 5:1,9	statements
78:21 79:6,13	stand 9:17	13:14,17 16:14	19:17 60:13
79:25 80:3,8	standard 63:21	16:18 26:7,12	74:6 75:21
86:16,23 94:11	96:8 167:25	26:23 27:4	84:7,8 95:12
96:22 123:21	168:2,6,10,18	37:25 38:6,20	166:23,23
123:25 129:24	168:21,23,25	39:2,16 40:10	179:1,9 181:15
130:3 136:20	169:7,9,14,18	40:17 42:7	182:20 186:15
139:16 140:18	169:19 170:24	43:14,18 45:23	189:25 190:10
142:10 143:10	171:2 172:1,3	46:10 56:12	states 1:1,8
158:11 181:13	172:6 232:22	67:21 79:7	15:22 39:19,23
186:9,14,22	232:23 233:14	146:10 160:18	48:17 50:15
187:12,21,25	233:20 234:3	169:13,16	63:20,24 64:1
188:5 189:6	standards	177:6,15 190:3	64:18 66:2,4
192:22 193:13	117:15 173:1,9	201:12,24	74:6 76:16
196:6 200:12	233:1,13,25	203:4,20,22	77:1,18 78:1,5
204:14 208:13	standing	204:4 205:14	83:9 84:18
212:13,19,23	195:20	205:18,24,25	85:7 87:7
217:18,21,25	stands 141:18	206:2 207:13	88:14 89:13,19
219:12 221:2	158:17 165:23	210:8 211:14	90:1,21,22
222:18 223:17	start 6:2 28:19	213:19 214:16	91:6,16,17
224:6,13,18	51:19 52:4	214:19 243:13	92:5 95:7,16
225:8,15,23	105:2,10	245:1 246:4	96:2,13 98:4
227:6,21 228:6	113:12,19	stated 84:17	98:17,18 99:5
228:19 229:3	129:5,5 141:1	147:19 174:23	100:12 101:6
229:10,15	144:18 163:7	178:19 231:22	101:17 102:15
230:5,10,16	171:6 172:2	245:12	103:5,7 107:11

107:22 108:2,3	219:13,17	stipulations 5:2	stumbled
109:3,13,21	220:2 235:21	stjohn 2:6	126:16 174:15
117:8,16,19,20	238:3,7,7	246:2	stuttered
118:4 119:18	241:7,8	stop 42:17	208:19
119:22 120:1	status 92:6	59:14 160:12	subcommittee
120:12,19	107:2 206:4,5	160:14,17	104:20 224:25
121:1,21	207:15 210:13	stopped 240:24	225:2
129:11 131:9	210:24	straightforwa	subheading
136:19 137:12	statute 164:10	55:15 149:17	87:24 88:9
140:2 144:13	165:19,19	street 2:4	90:24 141:13
144:17 145:2	169:11,13	strength 99:7,7	subject 45:17
145:11,12	172:7 219:19	137:10 139:8	45:25 58:6
146:20,23	statutorily	strike 221:4	63:22 96:17,17
147:1,21,25	220:5,7	strong 7:11	117:11,14
158:20 159:20	statutory 52:4	138:11 186:4	164:5 165:15
159:24 164:25	56:18 69:8	structure 210:6	232:7,8
165:12,13	153:23 164:13	216:25	subjects 63:11
170:15 176:11	164:18 165:20	student 203:5	81:11
176:13,18,24	167:21 168:3	203:15	submissions
176:25 177:4	168:22,23	students	17:10
177:21,25	170:13 171:2,5	207:15 210:13	submit 35:17
182:13 189:8	171:10,15	210:20	submitted
189:12,20	219:15	studied 92:21	17:18,21,25
211:11 219:3	stay 144:13	studies 12:17	18:4 217:5
220:19 226:9	staying 134:22	12:18 19:7	subsequent
226:22 227:14	160:21	26:21 27:3,7	86:9 166:14
227:24 230:19	steady 88:13	29:5 39:18	subsequently
236:15	115:23	57:11 214:15	202:19
static 101:25	steps 21:5 95:3	215:2 226:1	substance
132:10	149:6,21 202:4	238:21,25	19:11 36:20
station 2:13	stew 58:16,24	study 30:25	51:18 82:6
statistics 3:11	61:12	37:24 38:4,18	86:14 182:25
3:13 29:10	stewart 228:21	38:18,24 93:2	substantial
74:25 92:22	229:1	93:17,20	164:4 168:9
116:16 118:15	stewart's	study's 57:20	233:20 234:4,7
118:16 122:21	228:24	stuff 24:24	substantive
124:10 137:25	stick 64:10	25:6 58:1 61:1	30:24 241:5
184:15 191:21	88:9 180:12	121:16	

successfully	sure 6:25 7:10	surprisingly	29:11 32:8
109:20	12:14 13:10	142:13	42:19 47:25
suddenly	19:24 26:14	survey 76:23	48:23,25 58:14
235:10	27:20 29:10	122:15	59:3,11 60:18
suffer 159:18	37:13 39:6	surveys 75:9	81:8 84:19
sufficient 44:23	42:15 44:11,13	75:16,17 76:5	87:10 98:4
84:19	49:2 52:24	sussing 237:5	106:3,6 140:8
sufficiently	58:9 62:16	swearing	147:8 149:6
219:3,7	66:25 77:3	239:19	152:6,15 153:6
suggest 193:4	82:8 85:17	sworn 4:3 5:18	153:13,15
suggestion	88:24 97:17	87:9 245:8	154:5 157:11
193:6	98:16 102:5	sydney 2:10	177:7 179:16
suggestions	105:2 107:6	symbiotic	181:23 186:2,4
60:12	109:1 113:9,10	121:6,7	193:19 198:9
summarize	115:17 124:8	syracuse 221:8	200:4 202:4
158:6	125:10 126:15	system 7:10	209:12 217:8
summarizes	127:18 128:3,5	54:17 56:12	217:16 238:13
211:19	130:6 133:17	131:10 132:5	240:7,8,11
summary	135:14,17	140:25 141:21	241:7,8
125:3 158:7	141:17 142:4	159:21 173:3,4	taken 1:13 4:6
summer 44:4	145:9 155:23	174:1,10,14	29:7 59:15
supervision	166:1 169:1	178:1	75:3 106:8
245:11	186:2 197:14	systems 102:13	111:11 112:8
supplement	198:16 210:17	t	141:2 188:17
155:12 156:22	211:1 214:2	t 2:9 62:1 76:15	217:23 244:2
supplemental	237:25 239:21	81:14 134:19	245:10
38:25 42:5	surge 113:19	221:6	takes 9:17
46:8 244:7	113:21,22	tab 21:18	153:9 174:2
supply 228:12	114:2,3,6,8,18	table 146:7	talk 7:24 18:8,8
support 109:8	114:18,25	147:3	18:23 19:11
161:1	115:20,21	tabulating	23:21 27:18
suppose 102:6	surged 113:16	125:11	32:21 48:5
138:16 235:9	surgeon 38:8	tacitly 199:9	68:13 76:19
supposed	surging 63:1	take 6:2 10:4,5	81:25 90:9
159:24 168:22	surprise	10:13 15:20,23	92:8 103:12,15
169:11	235:12	16:1 19:23	105:5 112:12
supreme 64:7	surprised	20:3 25:1	112:13 119:4
122:18 205:23	66:15		142:24 148:7

[talk - text] Page 58

148:12,12	tolly 222.22	186:3,24	78:13,19
151:17 154:20	tally 222:22 223:1	194:23 203:21	116:20 209:5,9
157:24 163:4			218:22 221:5
	tamp 120:10	223:6	
177:1 178:9	tanf 146:22	telling 123:14	225:20 230:18
179:14,17	147:23	temporary	236:8
184:16 199:1	tango 82:22	39:1 42:6 46:9	testifies 5:18
201:11 227:7	tank 60:23	ten 24:17,18,20	testify 187:11
talked 48:7	tax 119:20	24:21 25:15,16	187:20 188:12
54:11 69:9	tbpra 72:25	25:17 34:19	241:1,4
83:13 98:6	team 218:24	48:21 49:6	testifying 78:2
109:11 112:14	219:2	52:13 53:5,8	79:3,22 186:20
119:12 135:19	teams 7:10	68:17 70:9,24	187:13
148:6 155:1	20:2 104:17	71:9,9,10 86:4	testimony 9:16
156:4 157:25	technically	103:4 150:14	10:25 11:15,20
175:5 201:11	215:17	150:17,18,22	12:7,8 13:15
202:9 213:3	technological	tense 167:14	14:16,20 35:18
218:3 219:13	19:23 21:10	tension 114:24	43:6,10,19
220:14 223:25	technology	tensions 135:7	44:17 45:4,7,8
229:25 239:8	152:16	term 76:15	45:9,13,15,16
talking 12:6	telford 19:8	88:12 89:22,23	46:2,4,13
35:4,6,13	tell 4:15 8:16	100:17 112:25	48:24 67:7
52:25 69:15	8:18 9:4 12:21	141:15 163:16	72:3,6,8 74:4
71:12 95:25	14:12 31:17	170:13 183:16	77:12 106:20
96:20 102:17	46:16 51:10	197:17 220:6	109:7,15
106:20 107:15	58:6 68:17	226:8	111:12 121:19
110:9 115:19	69:16 71:19,24	terms 15:6	123:6,11
115:21 129:25	73:4 82:5	98:14	124:25 179:13
164:18 169:25	85:13 86:13	terribly 234:3	189:2 209:12
171:21,22,23	88:22 94:1,5	territory	209:15 214:1
184:22 185:7	98:13 99:9	120:23	220:11 243:3,6
191:3,8 206:14	109:22 114:16	tested 39:22	245:7 246:9,18
207:4,9 213:6	116:4,12 124:6	41:22 42:11	texas 63:20
226:12 229:18	125:8,13 134:8	146:24 148:8	64:7 81:2 85:6
230:12	141:18 142:14	testified 15:10	122:17,19
talks 107:8	152:1 153:16	42:25 43:3,13	124:9 126:9
110:21 111:7	153:16 158:6	44:15 45:20	127:19
131:15 135:20	158:19 165:9	46:8,20 56:25	text 6:5 52:21
148:3 194:5	166:3 168:13	61:11 67:16	52:23 121:12

[text - thought] Page 59

163:8 166:10	134:1,22	thonkfully	27.10 26.2 14
thank 5:16 6:1	134.1,22	thankfully 212:19	27:10 36:2,14 43:5 44:3,8,23
6:4 7:7,17 8:3	142:22 143:22	thanks 6:11,15	48:17 51:15
8:11 9:1,9 10:3	142.22 143.22	21:11,12 22:9	52:13 56:1
· ·	144.10 145.4	23:4 59:7 94:4	
11:18,22,23 12:11 13:20	151:15 152:25		60:23 62:3,11
		102:17 145:21	68:15 82:24
16:4,20,21	157:18 158:4	157:12,13	83:5,12 84:9
18:25 20:21	158:15 159:10	166:1 185:2	84:24 85:9
23:11,18 25:11	160:2,11	208:4 217:10	86:19 89:7,14
25:11,12 27:16	162:13,19	theory 211:9	89:21 94:2
29:2 33:2,22	163:19,23	thereto 244:8	95:11 99:10
36:18,24 37:21	165:8,23	thesis 28:12	100:7,14
38:13,22 39:4	166:10 167:6,9	50:22 51:10	101:13 115:6
41:1,23 42:13	168:17 169:1	thing 5:24	126:16 129:25
43:25 44:6,11	169:17,22	23:20 58:7	131:21 132:7
45:1,12 46:7	170:2 171:25	60:18,22 81:18	135:10 141:16
46:16 47:13	172:8,15	118:1 145:16	147:10 152:11
48:2,3 50:4	173:11 174:18	148:2 155:14	154:18 155:21
51:5 53:2	176:5 182:17	181:24 202:7	157:19,21
55:11 57:10	184:14 188:15	235:1 241:11	174:15 176:6
62:4,19 64:15	191:11 192:12	things 10:17	186:25 188:3
65:12 68:6,8	193:23 194:20	27:15 33:16	189:7 194:7,22
68:15,20 69:9	194:25 195:3	35:19 38:10,12	197:21 208:18
70:5 73:6 75:2	196:1,10,13,18	55:3 57:25	209:14 210:10
78:25 82:23	197:14,25	60:6,23 75:23	211:22 212:10
85:18 93:16	198:1,5 200:17	92:16 95:19	219:23 222:20
94:16,20,23	203:2,23 205:4	98:18 103:20	229:18 235:15
97:20,22 99:18	206:10 207:2	112:20 117:5	236:7,8 240:6
99:19 103:12	208:22,24	123:12 125:2,4	240:10 242:10
106:1,2 111:1	209:10 210:15	125:10,23	thinking 56:3
115:5,8,16	211:20 214:6	130:22,23	102:6 194:23
116:10,15	214:11,11	133:8 155:12	third 150:19
121:2,8 124:1	215:18,20	157:12 176:15	189:2 194:16
126:19,19	216:10,20	226:4,18,19	thirds 141:9
127:13,14	217:8,9,22	236:10 237:2,5	thomas 82:21
128:1,4 130:5	218:2 231:1	239:21	thought 60:1,2
133:17,19,20	240:5 241:10	think 21:12,17	66:14 129:21
133:21,25	242:11,13	21:23 22:4	145:8 155:19
	www.ConitalDono		

		1	1
197:16 198:12	106:15 110:8	19:10,17 25:1	topic 106:5
206:25 212:16	110:10,15	77:13 97:17	torture 52:5
212:17 216:22	111:3,4,7,15	224:8 225:20	56:20,20
222:7 227:12	112:6 120:22	227:8,11	164:16 165:9
241:3,25	124:20 137:14	230:17 235:14	165:11,15,18
thoughts 131:1	140:18 153:22	237:15 238:18	165:21,24
155:22	154:9,11,13,15	240:4 242:13	167:23 168:5
thousand	154:25 156:3	242:14	168:25 171:13
222:11,11	161:9,12,15	todd 81:7,13	171:17,18
223:4	169:23 170:3	together 83:7	total 212:14
thousands	180:19 184:19	123:16 124:22	touch 62:3
234:22	187:18 189:23	126:22 127:7	tourist 177:8
three 18:13	202:16,17,22	told 8:22 67:19	177:10
31:13,14 51:25	202:23,24	67:21 92:19	toward 143:19
55:8 100:1	207:4 212:8	138:25 154:1	towards 34:2
140:8,8 141:10	222:6 223:7	159:10 227:14	trac 58:9 221:6
167:25 174:16	236:5,22	227:25 228:11	221:6,9,16,20
240:6,10	246:19	236:4	222:3,7 223:9
throw 234:13	timeframe	tolerate 79:7,7	223:19
234:14	246:8	190:3	trac's 221:12
thrown 234:9	timeline 153:19	tomorrow	track 12:18
234:11	times 18:7	15:18 47:24	205:20 218:13
thursday 1:14	24:11 42:25	tongue 98:15	221:21,21
tick 89:20	54:11 57:17	took 9:20 29:5	222:13
116:2	100:3 110:1	30:25 32:3	tracks 218:15
ticked 114:20	133:23 218:3	60:12 84:6	234:4
ticks 185:10	224:7 234:22	86:6 89:16,24	traditionally
tie 83:7	239:20	110:12,19	74:16 75:5
ties 55:20	timing 184:24	111:5,14,19	trafficking
time 6:20 12:22	title 23:1 50:6	146:9 151:5	69:10,13
18:17 31:18	50:24,25 51:5	206:18 207:17	train 155:19
37:15,17 40:19	113:23 158:22	209:15	training 93:5
41:20,22 46:3	164:12	top 23:13 34:17	93:10,11
47:2 48:19	today 11:1,16	34:18 52:9,14	transactional
49:16 50:25	11:20 13:21	52:17 146:7	221:7
51:2 58:3,3,13	16:16,18,25	191:16 195:21	transcribe 7:12
59:14 85:3	17:14,17 18:10	209:17	transcribed
97:18 103:23	18:15,18 19:6		245:10

	T		
transcriber	228:18 245:17	190:12 206:10	162:17 219:23
119:20 134:19	trump 51:3,13	turning 6:4	239:18,25
158:3 231:17	51:16 83:2	9:15 23:25	uac 69:4
transcript	89:15,16,22	42:18 51:5,6	uacs 68:23 69:1
10:23,24 11:6	111:18,24	80:12 166:10	ugly 121:7
23:18 186:15	112:2 114:1	tvpra 69:9	uh 7:4
189:18 242:18	161:18	twice 190:19	ultimate 169:6
244:3,4 245:8	trump's 48:10	191:1 207:1	169:9 235:17
245:17 246:6	trust 49:25	twister 98:15	ultra 64:9
246:20	176:23	two 34:12 35:6	unaccompani
transcripts	truth 166:13	35:14 37:14	69:5,6,7
167:18	truthful 9:20	40:7,13 42:2	207:12
transfer 52:14	11:20	51:21,24,25	unauthorized
52:16,17	try 7:24 8:1	86:4 102:7	144:15
118:15,16	21:10 25:24	115:13 118:17	under 9:16
122:20 124:10	41:13 45:16	121:4,13 141:9	15:20 16:2
transferred	67:1 94:6	143:25 146:7	36:5 39:25
124:17 138:5	106:18 125:17	147:3 160:25	48:1 49:14
transit 101:5,6	163:19 173:13	161:2,13	56:18,19 71:4
translator 81:9	187:8 232:16	174:15,16	77:13 112:18
transparency	trying 20:22	199:22 206:17	112:18 114:4
123:8	43:5 44:2	222:11 233:1	117:13 122:14
transpired	79:14 82:24	233:13,25	132:2 136:18
237:14	87:14 136:25	236:20 240:6	138:6 139:24
travel 48:10	157:13,15	240:10 241:5	142:18 149:8
51:13	173:21 192:4	type 218:6	149:12 150:22
treat 238:13	204:20 207:3	types 167:25	153:15 155:5
trial 9:18 11:7	241:2	typically 75:7	164:14,15,21
56:25 57:1	turn 9:10 11:25	typo 53:9,10	168:3,15,24
104:6 224:21	27:17 39:4	typos 11:2	171:15,16,17
triangle 74:21	51:17 59:8	u	175:15,20,25
trick 21:10	61:15 62:5,6	u 62:1 158:3	176:8,14 178:5
tries 177:3	62:21 74:8	u.s. 2:11 50:6	178:17,25
trouble 52:22	87:23 106:11	73:12 77:7	183:20 184:1,2
130:7 173:12	128:6 141:4	78:7 84:13	184:18 193:18
true 7:8,18	145:19 157:20	85:11 113:15	196:16,16
171:4 223:18	163:3,4 169:22	139:15 145:7	199:24 200:2
223:19 227:16	170:3 187:6		203:16 205:15

[under - used] Page 62

205:23 210:9	undoubtedly	119:21,25	unskilled 103:2
215:16 219:21	150:25	120:12,19	unused 64:12
219:24 231:5	unfortunate	121:1,21	65:13 66:3
231:14 236:16	189:21 190:5	129:11 131:9	67:2
245:10	unfortunately	136:19 137:11	upfront 39:6
underestimate	15:21	140:2 144:13	ups 59:19
221:24,25	unfrozen 89:1	144:16 145:2	uptick 84:6
undergraduate	unilaterally	145:11,12	upwards 223:1
29:13	131:9	146:20,23	223:3
understand	union 37:16	147:1,21,25	ur 157:25
6:18 7:4,14 8:8	39:8,10,15	158:20 159:20	158:2,4
8:13,15,23 9:6	40:8,14 42:3	164:24 165:12	usc 131:13
9:19 10:8,14	227:15,24	165:13 170:14	220:7
10:19 11:3,8	unique 98:19	176:11,13,18	uscis 72:10
11:11 12:5	unit 67:14	176:24,25	142:25 145:25
17:5 26:8 77:4	236:9,11,17	177:3,21,25	146:8 157:25
115:13 121:3	united 1:1,8	189:8,12,19	158:9,17 159:1
140:23 141:24	15:22 39:23	211:11 219:3	159:6,23
163:18,21	48:17 50:15	220:19 226:9	172:12 236:9
189:9 197:21	54:24 63:20,24	226:21 230:19	236:17
202:21 210:15	64:1,17 66:2,4	236:14	usdoj.gov 2:14
220:17	74:5 76:16	units 82:11	use 7:10 14:25
understanding	77:1,18 78:1,5	231:12,19,23	39:23 59:2
8:22 71:11,20	83:9 84:18	university	65:14 67:4,5,9
71:21 142:15	85:7 87:7	27:25 28:4,7	69:5 98:7
166:3 178:20	88:14 89:13,19	28:17 29:20,25	107:16 119:16
184:8 206:6	89:25 90:21,22	30:7 32:8	148:8,13,13,20
235:4 241:17	91:6,15,17	37:23,24 38:3	154:21 163:16
understood	92:4 95:7,16	38:4,9,16,17	163:18,19
8:19 157:9	96:1,13 98:3	38:23,24 92:20	168:20,22
169:2 230:11	98:17,18 99:5	93:2,14 221:8	183:10 191:9
237:20	100:12 101:6	241:6,8	196:18 198:2
underutilize	101:17 102:15	unknown	238:10 244:7
63:8	103:5,7 107:11	220:8,16	used 14:21
underutilized	107:22 108:2,3	unlawful 84:18	61:8,12 64:1
62:24	109:2,13,21	unquote 110:5	65:1 75:18
undetained	117:8,16,18,20	unscrupulous	76:16 82:18
230:23	118:3 119:18	155:15	88:10,18 89:22

[used - want] Page 63

98:5 100:17	61:10	210:9,22	visited 65:19
103:16 123:15	variations	231:16	visiting 66:20
125:1 127:17	54:18 55:12	vez 100:9	visual 89:2
127:22 132:21	56:22 57:7	vice 95:14	vitter 207:7
170:13 179:8	203:16	vicente 120:8	vitters 210:22
189:23 197:16	various 12:19	victims 69:10	voice 7:11
246:20	57:21 74:6	69:13	volume 50:9
uses 164:3	103:22 123:15	video 1:13 4:12	vulong 2:10
using 7:5 41:25	124:5 127:7	188:1	W
41:25 66:5	154:15 163:14	view 23:13	w 232:4
114:5 140:13	204:24	96:4 134:24	wages 148:4
141:15 196:13	vast 217:1	158:24 161:23	226:6
usually 31:13	venezuela	viewed 120:14	wait 8:4,8
39:25 134:20	100:9,15	views 75:10	waited 68:7
164:23	venezuelan	76:22 77:20	waiting 144:14
utilization	118:3	violence 99:15	waiver 176:14
135:9	venezuelans	100:8	177:9,11,15
utilize 66:21	100:11	vires 64:9	waivered
131:11	veracity 181:18	virginia 28:1,4	107:13
v	verbal 7:2	28:8,17 29:20	waives 237:6
v 1:6 246:4	verify 246:9	29:25 31:20	walk 95:2
vague 15:10	veritext 246:14	32:6 37:23	127:16 138:18
41:12 66:9	246:23	38:3,17,23	139:7 145:7
	veritext.com	92:20 93:2,15	
6/:/ 139:16		· ·	185:25 237:13
67:7 139:16 143:10 151:21	246:15	241:6,9	185:25 237:13 want 4:18 6:2
143:10 151:21	version 196:19	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9	want 4:18 6:2
143:10 151:21 204:14	version 196:19 196:19 218:12	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14	
143:10 151:21 204:14 validity 174:13	version 196:19 196:19 218:12 versus 12:9	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14 22:4 33:21	want 4:18 6:2 27:20 33:12
143:10 151:21 204:14	version 196:19 196:19 218:12 versus 12:9 51:16 63:20	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14 22:4 33:21 virtually 237:1	want 4:18 6:2 27:20 33:12 35:16 44:13
143:10 151:21 204:14 validity 174:13 valley 81:3	version 196:19 196:19 218:12 versus 12:9 51:16 63:20 64:7,20 67:12	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14 22:4 33:21 virtually 237:1 vis 69:21,21	want 4:18 6:2 27:20 33:12 35:16 44:13 48:25 52:23
143:10 151:21 204:14 validity 174:13 valley 81:3 113:22	version 196:19 196:19 218:12 versus 12:9 51:16 63:20 64:7,20 67:12 74:5 76:16	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14 22:4 33:21 virtually 237:1 vis 69:21,21 91:15,15	want 4:18 6:2 27:20 33:12 35:16 44:13 48:25 52:23 60:16 62:16
143:10 151:21 204:14 validity 174:13 valley 81:3 113:22 valleys 114:21	version 196:19 196:19 218:12 versus 12:9 51:16 63:20 64:7,20 67:12 74:5 76:16 85:6 108:3	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14 22:4 33:21 virtually 237:1 vis 69:21,21 91:15,15 137:20,20	want 4:18 6:2 27:20 33:12 35:16 44:13 48:25 52:23 60:16 62:16 72:15 84:17,20
143:10 151:21 204:14 validity 174:13 valley 81:3 113:22 valleys 114:21 114:22 115:18	version 196:19 196:19 218:12 versus 12:9 51:16 63:20 64:7,20 67:12 74:5 76:16 85:6 108:3 109:5,13,14	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14 22:4 33:21 virtually 237:1 vis 69:21,21 91:15,15 137:20,20 visa 176:14	want 4:18 6:2 27:20 33:12 35:16 44:13 48:25 52:23 60:16 62:16 72:15 84:17,20 91:20 110:23
143:10 151:21 204:14 validity 174:13 valley 81:3 113:22 valleys 114:21 114:22 115:18 115:20,24	version 196:19 196:19 218:12 versus 12:9 51:16 63:20 64:7,20 67:12 74:5 76:16 85:6 108:3 109:5,13,14 122:17,19	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14 22:4 33:21 virtually 237:1 vis 69:21,21 91:15,15 137:20,20 visa 176:14 177:5,9,11,14	want 4:18 6:2 27:20 33:12 35:16 44:13 48:25 52:23 60:16 62:16 72:15 84:17,20 91:20 110:23 119:16 122:8
143:10 151:21 204:14 validity 174:13 valley 81:3 113:22 valleys 114:21 114:22 115:18 115:20,24 variable 58:16	version 196:19 196:19 218:12 versus 12:9 51:16 63:20 64:7,20 67:12 74:5 76:16 85:6 108:3 109:5,13,14 122:17,19 124:9 126:10	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14 22:4 33:21 virtually 237:1 vis 69:21,21 91:15,15 137:20,20 visa 176:14 177:5,9,11,14 177:24	want 4:18 6:2 27:20 33:12 35:16 44:13 48:25 52:23 60:16 62:16 72:15 84:17,20 91:20 110:23 119:16 122:8 126:15 127:2,3
143:10 151:21 204:14 validity 174:13 valley 81:3 113:22 valleys 114:21 114:22 115:18 115:20,24 variable 58:16 58:24	version 196:19 196:19 218:12 versus 12:9 51:16 63:20 64:7,20 67:12 74:5 76:16 85:6 108:3 109:5,13,14 122:17,19 124:9 126:10 127:19 170:25	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14 22:4 33:21 virtually 237:1 vis 69:21,21 91:15,15 137:20,20 visa 176:14 177:5,9,11,14 177:24 visas 177:8,11	want 4:18 6:2 27:20 33:12 35:16 44:13 48:25 52:23 60:16 62:16 72:15 84:17,20 91:20 110:23 119:16 122:8 126:15 127:2,3 128:5 130:6
143:10 151:21 204:14 validity 174:13 valley 81:3 113:22 valleys 114:21 114:22 115:18 115:20,24 variable 58:16 58:24 variation 54:4	version 196:19 196:19 218:12 versus 12:9 51:16 63:20 64:7,20 67:12 74:5 76:16 85:6 108:3 109:5,13,14 122:17,19 124:9 126:10	241:6,9 virtual 4:9 7:9 7:19 20:14 22:4 33:21 virtually 237:1 vis 69:21,21 91:15,15 137:20,20 visa 176:14 177:5,9,11,14 177:24	want 4:18 6:2 27:20 33:12 35:16 44:13 48:25 52:23 60:16 62:16 72:15 84:17,20 91:20 110:23 119:16 122:8 126:15 127:2,3 128:5 130:6 133:9 135:17

[want - words] Page 64

187:14 188:23	186:2 188:4	wetherell 76:15	187:3,3 189:11
191:9 217:17	195:12 199:3	109:13	189:14,24
223:3 226:19	199:10 215:15	wetherell's	196:8 200:14
239:17 241:1,2	215:19 235:7	108:19 109:6	202:8 208:15
241:4 242:6,13	237:1	white 76:19	212:20 219:7
242:18	ways 10:18	77:12 82:13	220:22 222:13
wanted 92:2	91:1,11 92:9	wilberforce	223:12,23
113:9,10	95:5 145:9	69:12 71:17	224:12 226:17
115:17 133:17	179:24	william 69:12	227:19 228:4
141:16 142:5	we've 4:24 59:9	71:16	228:16,23
156:21,24	74:14 75:4	window 232:13	229:8,14 230:3
202:5 212:15	90:19 135:10	wish 195:19	230:9,15
223:8 242:11	140:7 141:15	244:4	231:11 233:5
wanting	166:2 176:20	withheld 165:2	233:14 234:18
186:23	190:6	withholding	235:6 236:20
wants 132:12	wear 52:20	52:4 56:18,19	237:23 238:6
139:20	web 195:13	164:11,14,19	238:16 240:12
war 99:14	197:22,25	164:19,21	242:15 243:1
120:5,6 229:17	website 26:13	165:2,3 167:21	244:5 245:7
229:23	57:20 58:2	167:22 168:3	246:8,10,12,19
warden 96:11	83:23 84:4,5,8	168:23 170:23	witnessed
warning 206:3	122:4 126:9	171:5,10,15,16	243:17
wars 100:3	128:16 181:5	179:4	wolf 209:5,6
washington	191:22,23	witness 4:3,6	wondering
2:13 30:7,8	197:11,23	5:13 6:22 15:5	240:22
32:5,5 37:23	week 6:21	15:10 23:12	word 61:12
38:3,17,23	150:14,15	36:12 42:9	75:19 81:13
watch 161:9	222:15	43:17 45:25	95:6 148:13,13
way 7:11 13:4	weekend 25:5	46:12 47:1,2,9	148:20 152:11
20:4 33:5 45:7	weights 104:24	65:10,19 67:9	154:21 158:22
87:14,23 90:22	welcome 218:1	73:21 77:16	183:11 209:8
91:18 94:3	welfare 39:20	78:4 79:11,15	words 7:5,21
104:10 105:19	41:17 160:1	87:1 94:14	55:8 69:2 88:2
110:10 112:21	went 11:12	96:23 97:1	107:16,24
130:23 139:20	25:5 37:3,6,8	124:2 130:2	118:8 122:1
141:9,10 154:4	137:17 161:15	136:21 140:21	133:18 152:20
156:25 160:19	western 1:1	143:11 156:8	160:2 163:20
161:24 172:24		158:13 181:15	163:25 174:15

[words - york] Page 65

174:16 198:17	229:17,23	170:5 196:23	111:6 122:8
206:17 207:21	235:4 237:8	213:18 216:13	129:23 133:15
207:25	worse 55:3	242:1	136:3 138:23
work 20:3 25:6	102:8 128:9,24	wrong 106:14	140:19 152:21
25:21 27:3,5	129:7,12	114:16 146:3	158:13 164:13
29:4 32:21	130:15,17,23	220:1	176:6 179:23
34:18 36:21	130:24 131:4	wrote 12:2,24	183:16 197:17
39:4,13,15,17	135:1 173:25	12:25 13:5	198:13 201:5
40:6,9,12,16	175:24 176:9	23:8 27:9	222:22 238:23
40:24 42:1,4	worth 45:3	35:11 42:24	year 14:2,10
42:10 57:11	wrinkle 17:12	48:9 49:25	24:23,24 25:4
59:22 83:9	write 6:17 17:4	58:4,16 60:7	28:1,2,3 31:16
87:22 92:5	31:22 34:22	60:17 61:4	32:9 36:2 44:2
94:25 95:9	39:22 49:23	62:22 68:21	58:5 73:5 81:3
108:15 122:10	59:4 60:6,15	70:23 77:23	89:10 114:20
122:11 128:20	61:13,13 119:8	84:10 86:3	132:12,12
138:19 145:10	125:13 166:11	87:19,19 88:2	133:20 136:5
145:11 217:2	190:25 198:18	106:12 108:5	149:15,16,17
225:25 226:10	209:17 214:12	110:2,4 121:13	149:19 150:1
227:3 238:3,20	214:17,19,23	121:17 129:7	154:6 209:5
239:12 241:18	215:3,11,24	143:9 145:24	years 31:13,14
worked 31:19	216:11,21	146:12,14	32:1 36:6
36:7,25 37:4	239:7 244:4	158:25 160:22	53:23,23 57:17
41:7,14 61:22	writes 57:19,20	190:22 197:8	89:10 93:7
216:22	57:25 81:10	197:10 201:23	96:14,15 103:4
workers 103:2	241:18	202:13 204:1,2	104:1,3 120:17
148:7	writing 13:11	209:22 241:23	143:2,16,18
working 25:14	34:13,20 48:3	\mathbf{y}	144:14 153:10
57:16 145:2,6	59:21 119:9	y 62:1 231:17	153:13,15
148:4 226:6	125:16 126:24	yeah 21:19	172:8,18,19,21
works 92:12	151:7 154:23	26:14 33:5	173:23 191:12
world 55:4	241:15	34:9 35:5 41:6	207:11,17
73:12 74:10,12	written 15:8,9	51:12 53:9,11	219:9 222:17
74:24 76:14	15:12 45:8,9	54:10 57:7	236:6
77:6,24 78:6	54:10 58:7	59:23 84:14	yesterday
80:15 81:24	89:21 114:15	87:1 92:3 95:5	18:10,12,18
83:5 84:12	125:2,4,10	107:14 110:20	york 226:25
85:10 103:22	160:19,20		

[yuma - zero] Page 66

	_	
yuma	81:2	
	Z	
zero	118:20	

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 30

- (e) Review By the Witness; Changes.
- (1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:
- (A) to review the transcript or recording; and
- (B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.
- (2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES

ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1,

2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES

OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted

fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions'
confidentiality and security policies and practices
should be directed to Veritext's Client Services
Associates indicated on the cover of this document or
at www.veritext.com.